DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 118 RC 010 367

AUTHOR	Mills, Patricia; Crawford, Leslie
TITLE	Fort Gay-Thompson Evaluation Project. Final Report, June 1973.
INSTITUTION	Bowling Green State Univ., Ohio. Office of Educational Research and Services.; Fort Gay - Thompson School District, W. Va.
PUB DATE	Jun 73
NOTE	165p.; For related documents see ED 134 385-386; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum; *Educational Assessment; Educational Facilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Materials; *Language Arts; Parental Aspiration; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Programs; Rural Schools; School Organization; Student Characteristics; Tables (Data); Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS	*West Virginia (Wayne County)

ABSTRACT

During the 1972-73 school year, the reading-language arts program of the Fort Gay-Thompson Schools was evaluated using data drawn from two major sources: intent--the planned-for conditions, behaviors, and effects; and observations--surroundings or events observed in a direct or personal way by the evaluator. Two categories of information were investigated within each source: antecedents--conditions existing prior to teaching and learning; and transactions--encounters of students with teachers or student with student, i.e., the succession of engagements which comprise the educational process. Specific antecedent conditions viewed as most critical to the program's effectiveness were student, teacher, and parent characteristics. Selected transactions were curricular content and context, instructional materials, physical plant, and school organization. Some of the evaluation findings were: primary grade students viewed reading primarily as form rather than function; elementary students considered reading as more important than did secondary students; teachers regarded using reading to learn something the student wanted to know as the most important objective; parents' expectations for their children were higher than the expectations of teachers or students. This report which is primarily descriptive in nature presents a detailed discussion of the evaluation findings, summarizes the findings, and presents recommendations based on the evaluators' judgments. Sixty-two tables of data are included. (NQ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151118

FINAL REPORT

FORT GAY-THOMPSON EVALUATION PROJECT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Mills

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Prepared by
Dr. Patricia Mills
Dr. Leslie Crawford
Office of Educational Research and Services
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio

RC010362

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

June 1973

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this evaluation of the Fort Gay-Thompson area is to analyze selected bodies of information which relate to the effectiveness of the reading-language arts program in those schools and to derive from that analysis some alternatives for decision-making in relation to the improvement of instruction in that area of the curriculum.

The model selected for the evaluation effort is an adaptation of the Stake model.[1] The design utilizes a three dimensional grid as the framework for identifying sources of information, categories of information to be investigated within each source, and specific types of data to be collected within each category. Two basic sources of information have been utilized: Intents, the planned-for conditions, behaviors, and effects, and Observations, surroundings or events observed in a direct or personal way by the evaluators. The categories of information existing in relation to each of these sources which have been explored are Antecedents, conditions existing prior to teaching and learning, and Transactions, encounters of students with teachers, student with student, i.e., the succession of engagements which comprise the process of education. It must be recognized, however, that the boundary between these two categories is not always clear, and, even more importantly, that only selected elements from each category can be investigated.

The selection of those elements to be investigated is at least partially explained by a basic assumption from curriculum theory. That is, the curricular system is the product of the interaction among several sub-systems. These are the administrative sub-system, the instructional sub-system, the curriculum development sub-system, and the personality sub-systems.[2] Thus, to understand any of these sub-systems or the system as a whole, it is necessary to consider the other related sub-systems.

---

[1] Robert E. Stake, "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation," Teachers College Record, 68 (1967): 523-540.

[2] James B. Macdonald, "An Example of Disciplined Curriculum Thinking," Theory Into Practice, 6 (October, 1967): 166-170.

Obviously, it is not possible to investigate all possible combinations of components in each of these sub-systems in one short-range evaluation effort. Therefore, what is investigated is to some extent a subjective judgment of the evaluator. In this instance, however, an effort has been made to select those components for consideration which have been shown to bear a strong relationship to the effectiveness of instructional sub-systems - particularly to instructional sub-systems representative of the reading-language arts area.

This evaluation is therefore focused upon seven selected elements of the curricular system. These are (1) Student Characteristics, (2) Teacher Characteristics, (3) Parent Characteristics, (4) Curricular Content and Context, and (5) Instructional Materials, (6) Physical Plant, and (7) School Organization.

The body of the report is primarily descriptive in nature since a second assumption underlying this evaluation effort is that evaluation is the process of providing information for the purpose of aiding decision-making within a specific school context. However, it is understood that decision-makers will be interested in knowing what options they may have with respect to actions that are suggested by the findings presented. Therefore, the final section of the report will present a summary of recommendations which have been derived from the standards established by the evaluators. Whether, in fact, these recommendations can or will be implemented must be decided in relation to the particular set of priorities inherent within the school-community context of the Fort Gay-Thompson area.

ANTECEDENTS

1. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

INTENTS

Available descriptions of the student population of the Fort Gay-Thompson Schools focus primarily upon outcome rather than upon antecedent data. A state-wide testing program is administered to all students in grades three, six, nine, and eleven and state means for comparisons of students in terms of achievement are available for these levels. National and county means are also used for making comparisons at these and all other grade levels, two through eleven. A summary of the most recent grade level means has been prepared by the county office (See Exhibit 1). Just what may be the nature and availability of specific results for utilization by classroom teachers in individual diagnosis and instructional evaluation is not specified. However, frequent references are made to the use of tests for diagnosis and grouping in the description of intents related to instructional content and context (See Section 3). The county office has developed a content analysis for Grade 3 English test results which indicated the kinds of errors students tended to make on the concepts tested but this applies to the county as a whole (See Exhibit 2). Pre- and post-test scores for students in the remedial reading programs throughout the county are also summarized but only 1970-71 results for secondary are shown for individual schools (See Exhibit 3). None of these data provides any indication of what the student brings to the program other than his past achievement.

Informal interviews and conversations with selected supervisory and teaching personnel suggested that the reported discrepancies between means of Fort Gay-Thompson students and those of other populations have affected students as well as teachers in their perspectives of school-related experiences. Both groups, teachers and students alike, have exhibited manifestations of defensiveness related to the use of these tests, but even so few teachers deny that lack of achievement (although perhaps not as defined by tests) is one of their major concerns. They frequently attribute this low achievement to the general construct, lack of motivation. Supervisory personnel, however, more often tend to regard lack of achievement as a function of ineffective instruction; i.e., the students will achieve if the instructional content and context and the skills of the teachers in planning and implementing learning activities can be improved.

Achievement or product-related information continues to be regarded as most informative in terms of student characteristics and as such is continuously recycled to create more and more generalized descriptions of students in achievement-related terms. Little recognition or systematic attention has been given to other student characteristics which color antecedent conditions such as learning style, life style, objectives, attitudes, and values.

OBSERVATIONS

During the first on-site visitation, observations were made of two student dimensions by means of three different measures. Two of these, The Concept of Reading Inventory and the Reading Objectives Survey, were utilized to determine the importance the student attaches to a number of selected reading-language arts behaviors. The third, the School Attitude Survey, is a measure of attitude toward self and toward school (See Exhibits 4, 5, and 6).

What the student values as well as what he thinks and feels about himself are thus assumed to be critical components in the description of curricular antecedents.

Reading Objectives.

The Concept of Reading Inventory was administered to 39 students in grade two and to 37 students in grade four from both the Thompson and Fort Gay Schools.

These students represent a random selection and number about one half the population of each grade level. They were asked to choose which of three "true" statements in each of twenty sets in their opinion best describes a good reader (See Exhibit 4). A total score in terms of right answers can be obtained as well as separate scores with respect to the proportion of checked responses for each item. Table 36 and Table 37 show the results of these observations. The group mean for students in grade two in terms of "right" answers was significantly different from that of students in grade four ($p < .01$).

However, when the frequencies of responses to each item were analyzed, it could be seen that those items which are considered "right" are infrequently chosen by both groups of students. Student responses tend to be more frequent with respect to items which have to do with reading smoothly and clearly, never hesitating or stumbling, and not asking the teacher to "tell him any words". Only in the fourth grade do any items which refer to comprehension appear as top-ranking items and these are those associated more with memory than with interpretation or application. Fourth graders do rank one item concerning enjoyment of reading (Rank = 15.5) relatively higher than do second graders but even so less than half the fourth graders considered this to be a better description of a good reader than tho other two alternatives; "Reads so that it sounds good to other", and "Tries to sound like the teacher when he reads".

It appears that these primary children are more aware of the overt appearance of reading, the form and the flow of the oral reading act, than with the enjoyment and the utilization of reading.

At the sixth, eighth, and tenth grade levels, the Reading Objectives Survey was administered to a total of 104 students. For all but the sixth grade this number represents about half the total grade level population randomly selected. However, due to an omission in administration of instruments, only samples from two of the three sixth grade classrooms are included.[3] Students were presented with twenty different reading objectives and asked to rank each on a 1-5 scale ranging from Very Unimportant (1) to Very Important (5). (Results are reported in Table 1.) They were also asked to indicate whether they thought they could do each of these things. (See Tables 29 and 33). Group means for ratings of the importance of each objective were then compared for each of the twenty objectives with the following differences noted among grade levels:

1. Objective #8 - *Use clues to letter sounds to identify unknown words*. Sixth grade students ranked this objective as significantly more important than did eighth or tenth grade students ($p < .05$, $p < .05$).

2. Objective #11 - *Change the rate of reading to fit different kinds of reading materials and different purposes*. Sixth grade students again ranked this more important than did tenth grade students ($p < .05$). There was no significant difference between means of sixth and eighth graders.

3. Objective #14 - *Recognize at sight the one hundred most commonly used words*. Sixth graders again considered this objective to be more important than did either eighth or tenth graders ($p < .01$, $p < .01$).

4. Objective #15 - *Use the card catalogue to find a book in the library*. Eighth graders were not different from sixth graders but ranked this skill as more important than did tenth graders ($p < .05$).

5. Objective #19 - *Interpret maps, charts, and graphs*. Sixth grade students considered this more important than did tenth grade students but not different from eighth graders ($p < .05$).

6. Objective #20 - *Separate fact from opinion and bias in what is read*. Sixth grade students again considered this of more importance than did eighth and tenth graders ($p < .05$, $p < .05$).

On all other objectives there were no significant differences between means from grade level to grade level.

Means tended to decline as grade levels increased but when all twenty objectives were ranked from highest to lowest in terms of means and the congruency calculated among these rankings (Table 25), a high degree of consistency was shown to exist among all three groups of students (Grades 6 and 8, rho = .73; Grades 6 and 10, rho = .73; and Grades 8 and 10, rho = .81). These high correlations suggest that students perceive the relative importance of these objectives quite similarly.

---

[3] Because of some negative responses to a press release prior to the evaluation, it was necessary to rely on teachers to administer these instruments.

Looking at the highest and lowest means in the ratings of objectives by each of these three groups (Table 27), it can be seen that oral reading and information locating skills along with the development of effective study skills were regarded by students to be most important. Least important to students were the recognition of sight words, the gaining of inferred meanings, the use of the newspaper, and choosing a variety of materials to read. Thus, even at the upper levels it appears that the student's priorities in reading focus upon the form of reading with function recognized primarily in association with school tasks.

In assessing their own competencies with respect to each of these objectives, students tended to estimate their capabilities at a high level. Sixth grade students indicated the highest rankings of competency on Objective #3 - Use a dictionary to find the meaning of a word, Objective #5 - Use reading to learn something you want to know, and Objective #13 - Divide words into syllables. One hundred percent thought they could do these things. At the eighth grade level, Objectives #3 and #6 gained the highest percentage (97.56%) of positive responses - Use a dictionary and Use an encyclopedia. Tenth graders ranked Objective #3, Objective #4 - Choose many different kinds of materials to read, and Objective #5 as their highest competency (95.12%).

Overall, Objective #3 retained the highest number of positive responses (96.34%).

It may be important to note that although students at all grade levels indicated oral reading to be of highest importance, this skill did not appear at any grade level as an area of perceived competency. However, use of the dictionary and the encyclopedia were consistently regarded as high in terms of both importance and perceived competency.

Objectives regarded of less importance by most students which were also perceived as areas of least competence were Objective #9 - Find hidden meanings or inferences, read "between the lines", Objective #14 - Recognize at sight the one hundred most commonly used words, and Objective #20 - Separate fact from opinion and bias in what you read.

Student Attitudes. The School Attitude Scale consists of nine different scales, four of which are designed to produce a measure of general attitude toward self (Scales 1-4) and four which measure attitude toward school (Scales 5-9). There are three forms of the Scale: One for grades 1-4; Two for grades 5-8; and Three for grades 9-12. Observations using this measure were made with 159 second, fourth, sixth, eighth, and tenth grade students in the Fort Gay and Thompson schools. (See Tables 41 through 45.) Again, students were selected randomly to include almost half of each grade level. However, responses of second grade students at Fort Gay were confounded by an error in administration and had to be omitted.[4]

Comparisons of means on each single scale and on the two general scales showed significant differences exist between grades 2 and 4 only on Scale 7 - attitude toward school in general ($p < .05$). On Scale Two used with sixth and eighth graders, numerous differences appeared; on Scale 2 - Self-concept in Relationships with Family ($p < .05$), Scale 5 - Attitude Toward Peers ($p < .01$), Scale 6 - Attitude Toward Teachers ($p < .05$), Scale 7 - Attitude Toward School in General ($p < .05$), Scale 9 - Attitude Toward Learning Activities ($p < .01$), and on both the general measure of Attitude Toward Self ($p < .05$) and Attitude Toward School ($p < .001$). In all cases these means indicate a lessening in positive attitude as the grade level increased.

---

[4] Again the reader is reminded that it was necessary to have teachers administer the student response instruments, and in this case the teacher arranged the answer sheets so that it was impossible to tabulate them accurately.

When the means reflecting the two general measures of Attitude Toward Self and Attitude Toward Schools were compared to means of urban students (scores of blacks and Mexican-Americans removed), significant differences appeared at the sixth ($p < .05$), eighth ($p < .05$), and tenth ($p < .001$) grade levels with respect to attitude toward self and at the fourth ($p < .05$), sixth ($p < .05$), and eighth ($p < .001$) grade levels in relation to attitude toward school. It should be noted, however, that means used for the general measures in Scale Three reflect scores for grades 9-12 urban youngsters and therefore are not directly comparable in grade level to the Fort Gay group which includes only grade 10.

In all cases the Fort Gay-Thompson means were lower than those of the urban students indicating less positive attitudes toward self and toward school.

Language Analysis. Recently considerable attention has been given to the possible effect of differences in language patterns upon the performance of students. It has been hypothesized that (1) textbooks and materials are often ill-suited to the dialect utilized by the students, and (2) students' proficiencies are often judged primarily in terms of consistency with "standard" patterns of speech rather than in relation to the effectiveness of their language in terms of function.

For these reasons it appeared advisable to analyze the language of students in the Fort Gay-Thompson Schools to determine if, in fact, there were significant deviations from standard patterns which might be expected to influence achievement.

For purposes of obtaining language samples, five students were randomly selected for the population of each of the second, fourth, sixth, eighth, and tenth grade levels. These students were then shown slides about which they were asked to comment. Their responses were taped, transcribed, and analyzed utilizing the verbalization levels of the Monroe and Rogers taxonomy, the Loban categories of language classification and structure, and the Fry Readability Guide. (See Exhibit 11 and Tables 61 and 62.)

All analyses were completed without knowledge of the actual grade level of the subjects. Although the sample is admittedly small, it may nonetheless serve as an indicator of particular elements of language usage which might be necessary to consider in instructional planning.

Of the total sample of twenty-four subjects, eight were found to be operating at Verbalization Level 2 - Describing, a level of response which indicates a relatively unsophisticated use of language. These eight subjects were actually assigned to several different grade levels (4 - grade 2; 1 - grade 4; 3 - grade 6). Four subjects' responses were categorized at Level 3 - Narrating (1 - grade 2; 1 - grade 4; 2 - grade 8). Six responded at Level 4 — Interpreting (1 - grade 2; 2 - grade 4; 2 - grade 6; 1 - grade 8). Six attained Level 5 — Evaluation (1 - grade 2; 1 - grade 4; 1 - grade 8; and 3 - grade 10). Although a clear developmental pattern is not indicated, maturation does seem to be associated with these findings more closely than any other possible explanation. However, it is also evident that various verbalization levels appear at all grade levels.

Following this initial analysis, seven of the original twenty-four samples were selected for further analysis in relation to language classification and sentence structure. Literal responses were most prevalent for all subjects regardless of grade level. Interpretations under Level II were frequent, but there was little use of figurative language, tentative statements or suppositions, or generalizations. Value judgments and comparisons at Level III were infrequent. Five of the seven subjects did demonstrate examples of appreciative language at Level 4.

Sentence patterns were basically simple subject-predicate (1) or subject-predicate-direct object (2) patterns. No examples of outer complements (5) nor passive forms nor even of mazes were found in the smaple. Numerous partials (10) were apparent. The structural patterns demonstrated indicated a lack of maturity and complexity in language development rather than any structural idiosyncracies which might be attributed to dialectical differences.

Estimated grade levels calculated by applying the Fry Readability Scale to oral language showed increasing discrepancies between estimated grade levels and actual grade level placement as actual grade level increased, again suggesting immaturity in language development.

Direct observations of classrooms generally validated the above findings. In most classrooms verbalizations by students were simple rather than complex in structure, mostly patterns 1 and 2 in the Loban structural categories. Quantitatively, verbalization by students was limited to responses to teacher-initiated questions and a few questions regarding directions or assignments. In only two of the classrooms visited were there frequent instances of student-initiated verbalizations.

2. TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

INTENTS

In recruitment and selection of teachers the Fort Gay-Thompson area suffers the limitations of both lack of financial incentive and unattractiveness of setting in which to pursue a professional career. Salary scales for the 1971-72 fiscal year in the State of West Virginia ranged from a minimum of $3,945 for a beginning teacher at the fourth class level with no experience to a maximum of $9,415 for the Ph.D. with nineteen years experience. Most counties also pay a supplement, but Wayne County, of which the Fort Gay-Thompson Schools are a part, offers additional amounts ranging only from $200 for the fourth class teacher to $800 for the MA, the MA + 15, the MA + 30, and the Ph.D.[5]

---

[5] Report to the State Board of School Finance, Daniel B. Taylor, Chairman, Charleston, West Virginia.

Such a salary base is thus most likely to attract teachers who cannot find employment elsewhere, those who for personal reasons wish to stay in the area, and perhaps a few "missionary spirits" who prefer to teach in a "challenging" context.

There have been no clear, well-defined standards applied to recruit teachers according to predetermined criteria with respect either to specific personal characteristics or professional skills; availability and at least minimum certification seem to be the requirements.

A serious effort is being made to upgrade the professional staff by offering presently employed teachers in-service workshops and encouraging their enrollment in college courses with free tuition offered for those who participate (See Exhibit 7). Emphasis in these activities had been upon improvement of knowledge and skills and objectives have been defined primarily in terms of developing teachers who are more expert in instructional techniques related to a specific area of instruction.

OBSERVATIONS

Reading Objectives.

In an effort to determine what teachers consider to be the desirable outcomes of instruction in reading-language arts so that their responses could be analyzed and compared with those of other concerned groups (students and parents), all elementary teachers and all secondary teachers except those in areas such as band, art, and library, were asked to complete either the Concept of Reading Inventory or an alternate form of the Reading Objectives Survey (See Exhibit 8).

Twenty elementary teachers, kindergarten through grade 4, completed the Concept of Reading Inventory. Their responses are summarized in Table 38. As discussed previously, items considered "right" for determining a total score are those which relate primarily to comprehension, interpretation, application, and enjoyment of reading rather than to speed, fluency, and other outward manifestations which may substitute for truly functional reading skills. These "right" statements also include reflections of feelings about the reading act - either feelings associated with the reading content or feelings of a positive nature toward the reading act itself. Of a possible score of 20, the teachers showed a group mean of 13.85. In examining the relative frequency of their selection of items, it can be seen that most of the "right" answers received the highest number of responses. Superficial aspects of reading appeared in the content of items infrequently selected. Items which suggest concern for phonics and word recognition generally achieved intermediary ranking. Two exceptions were adjustment of reading rate (Item 14-1) which was accorded relatively low status by these teachers (Rank=27.5) and accuracy (Item 16-1, Rank=45).

A total of twenty-two teachers of grades five through twelve, including teachers whose teaching assignments are in fields other than the reading-language arts, responded to the teacher form of the Reading Objectives Survey. This Survey is similar to the student form except that it contains a total of thirty items, only twenty of which are used for scoring. It also requests teachers to indicate what percentage of their students they estimate can do the bahavior stated and to state whether they attempt to teach that behavior.

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of teachers' ratings of these twenty objectives classified according to teaching field; elementary, secondary English, secondary other, secondary all, and teachers all. The only significant differences between means scores for these groups were as follows: For Objective #16 - Outline the main ideas from what has been read - elementary teachers indicated a significantly higher priority for this behavior than did secondary English teachers ($p < .05$).[6] Objective #17 - Recognize common symbols and signs such as highway signs and warning labels was accorded higher priority by those teachers not assigned to the reading-language arts areas than by those who are.

In ranking objectives from highest to lowest in terms of mean ratings, a relatively strong congruence appears among the priorities of teachers. (See Table 25). The lowest correlation (rho=.55) was reflected when comparisons were made between all teachers of reading-language arts (elementary and secondary) and other secondary teachers.

---

[6] It should be noted that secondary English refers to all secondary teachers of reading-language arts. The teachers themselves tended to refer to their field as "English".

In examining the highest and lowest group means of teacher ratings (Table 26), it can be seen that both elementary and secondary teachers regarded Objective #5 - *Use reading to learn something the student wants to know* - as having top priority. Other commonly valued objectives were Objective #10 - *Tell in one's own words the main ideas of what has been read* and Objective #12 - *Use other words in a sentence to recognize an unknown word*. Elementary teachers rated Objective #3 - *Use of the dictionary* - and Objective #8 - *Use clues to letter sounds to identify unknown words* - as highly important. Secondary teachers, both reading-language arts and others, regarded Objective #19 - *Interpret maps, charts, graphs* - as highly important.

Of low importance to all teachers was Objective #1 - *Read aloud in a clear voice with good expression and proper speed* and Objective #14 - *Recognize at sight the one hundred most commonly used words*. For elementary teachers, use of the card catalogue (Objective #15), recognition of common signs and labels (Objective #17), and changing rate (Objective #11) held the least importance. Secondary teachers regarded choosing to read in free time (Objective #18), dividing words into syllables (Objective #13), and finding information from the newspaper (Objective #12) their least important concerns.

In sum, it appears that both elementary and secondary teachers tend to consider most important those aspects of reading which are most closely associated with typical school tasks. In their valuing of objectives they tend to minimize the importance of oral reading and to give little recognition to personal or more broadly utilitarian functions of reading.

In estimating the competencies of their students with respect to these various objectives, teachers held relatively low expectations for a substantial proportion of their students. The mean percentage of estimates of student performance over all objectives were 55.9 for the elementary teachers, 62.78 for the elementary teachers exclusive of those in remedial reading or special education, 67.97 for secondary teachers of reading-language arts, and 54.59 for all secondary teachers. (See Table 30.)

Table 32 shows the highest and lowest rankings of student competencies as perceived by teachers. Areas of greatest proficiency at the elementary level (when ratings of teachers of remedial reading and special education were removed) were estimated for Objective #5 - Use reading to learn something the child desires to know, Objective #17 - Recognize common signs and symbols, and Objective #3 - Use the dictionary.

For secondary teachers of reading-language arts, Objective #3 and Objective #17 were also perceived as areas of highest proficiency.

For all secondary teachers the greatest extent of student proficiency was again perceived to be in relation to Objective #3 - Use the dictionary with Objectives #5 and #17 again ranked next in priority. Telling main ideas and utilizing maps and graphs were also given high competency ratings by both the elementary and secondary groups.

Least proficiency among elementary students as perceived by elementary teachers was in using the card catalogue (#15). Other less highly achieved objectives were the use of context clues (#2), changing rate to fit material (#11), and separating fact from bias (#17).

Secondary teachers found the use of effective study skills (#7) the weakest area of student performance with use of context clues (#2) and separation of fact and bias (#20) next in order. It is perhaps important also to note that secondary English teachers viewed recognition of sight words (#14) as the area of least competence and that all secondary teachers considered this an area of minimum competency.

Both groups, elementary and secondary, are consistent in rating context clues, separation of fact and bias, and use of the card catalogue as areas of minimum competence.

In comparing elementary teachers' priorities in objectives with their ratings of student competencies, it can be seen that using reading to learn something the student wants to know, using the dictionary, and telling the main idea of what was read are given both high priority and seen as areas of highest student competence. Use of context clues, however, is valued highly but seen as an area of least competence.

Use of the card catalogue and changing rate to suit the material received low priority ratings and are also seen as areas of low student competence.

Secondary teachers rated using reading to learn something the student wants to know, telling main ideas of what has been read, and using maps and graphs as areas of both high importance and high student competence. Recognition of sight words received low priority ratings and low student competency ratings.

Finally teachers were asked to respond to the question "Do you teach this?" with respect to each of the objectives. Table 35 presents these findings.

Over half the elementary teachers indicated they did not teach the following:

#12 Find information from each of the different parts of the newspaper (40%).

#14 Recognize at sight the one hundred most commonly used words (40%).

#15 Use the card catalogue to find a book in the library (0%).

#17 Recognize common symbols and signs such as highway signs and warning labels (40%).

The last three of these objectives were items also accorded the least priority in terms of importance.

At least half the secondary teachers of reading-language arts indicated they give no attention to the following objectives:

#12 Find information from each of the different parts of the newspaper (50%).

#14 Recognize at sight the one hundred most commonly used words (25%).

#17 Recognize common symbols and signs such as highway signs and warning labels (0%).

More than half of the other secondary teachers provided no instruction in these objectives:

#1 Read aloud in a clear voice with good expression and proper speed (46.2%).

#8 Use clues to letter sounds to identify unknown words (38.5%).

#9 Recognize unstated but inferred meanings, read "between the lines" (46.2%)

#14 Recognize at sight the one hundred most commonly used words (23.1%).

#15 Use the card catalogue to find a book in the library (30.8%).

#18 Choose reading as a preferred activity during free time (46.2%).

Objectives #1, #14, and #18 were also given low priority rankings by this same group of teachers.

One hundred percent of all teachers, elementary and secondary, indicated that they teach Objective #10 - Tell in one's own words the main ideas of what has been read. Over ninety percent indicated they were teaching the student to use reading to learn something he desires to know (#5).

The following objectives were reported as being taught by less than half the teachers from all levels:

#14 Recognize at sight the one hundred most commonly used words (27.27%).

#15 Use the card catalogue to find a book in the library (27.27%).

#17 Recognize common symbols and signs such as highway signs and warning labels (40.90%).

Comparisons of Teachers' and Students' Ratings of Objectives. When students' ratings of reading objectives are compared with those of teachers, it can be seen that *elementary* teachers and pupils are generally in agreement concerning the importance of these selected objectives. Only one significant difference was found between these two groups' ratings - Objective #9 - *Recognize unstated but inferred meanings* ($p < .05$) (See Table 11).

However, *secondary* teachers and students differ significantly with respect to the importance of numerous objectives, and *in all cases* of significant differences, the teachers rank the objectives higher in importance than do the students. Below are the specific objectives upon which significant differences are found when scores for all teachers and students are pooled. (See Tables 4 through 21 for complete summaries.)

#1 - *Read aloud in a clear voice with good expression and proper speed*	$p < .05$
#2 - *Use other words in a sentence to recognize an unknown word*	$p < .01$
#5 - *Use reading to learn something the student desires to know*	$p < .001$
#9 - *Recognize unstated but inferred meanings - read "between the lines*	$p < .001$
#10 - *Tell in one's own words the main ideas of what has been read*	$p < .001$
#12 - *Find information from each of the different parts of the newspaper*	$p < .01$
#19 - *Interpret maps, charts, graphs*	$p < .05$
#20 - *Separate fact from opinion and bias in what is read*	$p < .01$

These considerable discrepancies may at least to some extent explain what teachers perceive to be a lack of motivation on the part of students to achieve in the areas that teachers consider of primary importance.

Comparisons of Teachers' and Students' Ratings of Competency. At all grade levels students' estimations of their own competency with respect to all objectives were greater than estimates of their teachers. Since specific examples of the kinds of items which might illustrate the skill called for by the description in the Reading Survey were not included, it may be that the student did not really understand the expectations inherent in the particular objective. Another explanation is that the students tend to have unrealistic images of their own ability to perform with respect to specific reading skills.

Responses of teachers did indicate a tendency to demonstrate generalized responses which seemed to be more a function of the individual teacher's view of the students than an ability to discriminate in terms of specific proficiencies of individual students. This was suggested by the fact that teachers scores tended to differ more from teacher to teacher than in terms of responses to different items from any one teacher.

The implication here is that more attention needs to be given to individual diagnosis in relation to specific skills to enable both students and teachers to have realistic expectations and to make it possible for teachers to adapt instruction to meet individual needs.

Teacher Attitudes. A dimension of teacher personality which may bear a relation to responsiveness to learning and change is a characteristic described by Rotter as generalized expectancy for internal versus external control of reinforcement.[7]

---

[7] Julian B. Rotter, "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monographs: General and Applied 80 (1966) 1-28.
Monographs:

The I-E Scale, an instrument developed by Rotter is purported to measure whether a person perceives events as under the control of powerful others or unpredictable due to the complexity of forces surrounding him (a belief in external control), or whether a person perceives that an event is contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics (a belief in internal control). It is hypothesized that if a person perceives a reinforcement as contingent upon his own behavior then the occurrence of either a positive or negative reinforcement will strengthen or weaken potential for that behavior to recur in the same or similar situations. Thus belief in internal control would be associated with greater responsiveness to adaptation or change. If this hypothesis is sound - and there is now considerable research adding support to the position - then it would follow that teachers who believe in internal control would be expected to be more likely to adapt their behavior in response to situations in which they are given positive or negative reinforcement than those more externally controlled.

The I-E Scale was therefore administered to the teachers in the Fort Gay-Thompson schools in an effort to determine whether as a group this faculty tends to be more external or internal in its orientation. Table 54 presents the means and standard deviations for all groups of teachers; primary, intermediate, special, English, and secondary other as well as totals for elementary, secondary, and all teachers. Analysis of variance performed with these scores indicated no significant differences exist among the groups. However, when the mean score of these teachers is compared to the mean of 1180 Ohio State University psychology students, the teachers are shown to be significantly more external.

These findings can only be viewed as suggestive since it may certainly be questioned whether comparisons between these groups are meaningful. However, there is at least the implication that the population from which these teachers are drawn may be highly external and that this consideration might well be recognized in terms of selection and in relation to in-service growth.

3. PARENT CHARACTERISTICS

INTENTS

Although it may reasonably be assumed that parents of Fort Gay-Thompson area students have held certain implicit and/or explicit expectations for the school in terms of general as well as specific objectives and that these expectations might well have been considered in curricular decision-making, there were no data available to indicate that this was so.

OBSERVATIONS

Reading Objectives. In an effort to secure initial base line data with respect to objectives parents consider of importance in the reading-language arts area, the Concept of Reading Inventory was distributed to 80 randomly-selected parents of second and fourth grade students (See Exhibit 4). Also the Reading Objectives Survey was distributed to 120 randomly-selected parents of sixth, eighth, and tenth grade students (See Exhibit 12). Questionnaires were first mailed to the selected parents, and then a follow-up was conducted by sending a second questionnaire home with students to those parents from whom initial responses had not been secured.

In all, a 60.5 percent response was obtained with percentages for each grade level as follows:

Grade	Total Sent	Total Returned	Percent
2	45	35	77.7
4	35	25	71.4
6	40	29	72.5
8	50	18	36.0
10	30	14	46.7

No significant differences existed between mean scores for responses to mailed questionnaires and those distributed through the schools; thus responses were pooled for analysis.

Of a possible score of 20 for the *Concept of Reading Inventory,* the mean score for parents of Grade 2 was 10.63 and for parents of grade 4, 10.40. However, since there was no significant difference between the two means, a summary of the total responses is presented in Table 39. Means of both groups of parents were significantly lower than those of teachers(See Table 40). It can be noted that in general parents selected responses that relate to the functional rather than the more superficial aspects of the reading act, although there is nonetheless a considerable emphasis upon form. This appears primarily in terms of responses which relate to the oral manifestations of reading behavior. "Correct" items which were omitted most often as indicators of a good reader were Item 14-1 - *Sometimes reads fast and sometimes reads slowly*; Item 5-1 - *Knows how to compare what he is reading about to his own life*; Item 8-3 - *Will usually choose books which are easy for him*, and Item 16-1 - *Reads just the words in the book*.

Means and standard deviations of parents' ratings of reading objectives as measured by the *Reading Objectives Survey* are presented in Table 3. With the exception of Objective #11 - *Change the rate of reading to fit different kinds of materials and purposes*, there were no significant differences among means scores for ratings of objectives by the three groups of parents. For Item #11, eighth and tenth grade parents differed significantly ($p < .05$) with the tenth grade parents regarding this item as more important.

Parents were also asked to assess the competence of their children with respect to each of the objectives listed. A summary of their ratings appears in Table 31. The lowest expectation in terms of parents responding "Yes" to the statement "I think my child can do this" was 61 percent for Objective #18 by eighth grade parents. (Read when you have free time because you like to.) Over 80 percent of all secondary parents (grades 8 and 10) indicated that they thought their children could accomplish all tasks except separating fact from bias (78 percent) and reading in free time because they like to (75 percent).

Ranking of competencies (See Table 34) indicated little discrimination between objectives except for sixth grade parents who regarded use of the dictionary (#3) and recognition of common symbols (#17) as areas of uppermost competence. Both eighth and tenth grade parents considered numerous objectives to be attained equally well by their children.

There was a greater tendency to discriminate in terms of least competency, but this was also minimal. Sixth grade parents indicated that the weakest areas of proficiency appeared to be in separating fact from bias, applying effective study skills, and choosing to read in free time. Eighth grade parents found recognizing inferences, selecting a variety of reading materials, and use of the card catalogue as areas of greatest weakness. For tenth grade parents, the only discriminant item was #14 - recognition of sight words - but, even so, 86 percent of the parents still thought their children competent in doing this.

What appears here in terms of parent assessment is a clear inability to judge their children's ability at least on the basis of a brief description of a specific objective. Age and grade level, in the parent's view, seems to be tied consistently to the ability to perform, so that these factors are more predictive of how the parent will view ability than the particular criterion indicated.

Comparison of Parents' and Teachers' Ratings of Importance of Reading Objectives. When parents' and teachers' ratings of the importance of various reading objectives are compared some significant differences are found.

Sixth grade parents rated use of the card catalogue and recognition of common symbols as significantly more important than did elementary teachers. (See Tables 16 and 18.) Eighth and tenth grade parents considered use of the encyclopedia more important than did secondary teachers. (See Table 8.)

Secondary teachers, however, considered being able to tell main ideas more important than did eighth grade parents (See Table 12) and using reading to learn something the student desires to know more vital than did tenth grade parents. (See table 7.)

For all other objectives there are no significant differences concerning the importance of the objective between mean scores for teachers and for parents.

In terms of top-ranking priorities between parents and teachers there was only limited agreement. Grade 6 parents and elementary teachers both ranked use of the dictionary and using reading to learn something the students wants to know in the top five. Grade 8 parents and secondary teachers agreed that using reading to learn should have high priority. Grade 10 parents and secondary teachers agreed only upon the importance of telling main ideas of what has been read.

There was less agreement between parents and students in terms of the importance of objectives. With the exception of one objective (#15) parents considered the following objectives to be significantly more important than did students.

Grade 6

#4 - Choose many different kinds of books and materials to read	$p < .05$
#9 - Recognize unstated but inferred meanings	$p < .05$
#16 - Outline the main ideas from what has been read	$p < .05$
#18 - Read when you have free time because you like to	$p < .05$

Grade 8

#5 - Use reading to learn something the student desires to know	$p < .05$
#14 - Recognize at sight the one hundred most commonly used words	$p < .01$
#15 - Use the card catalogue to find a book in the library	$p < .05$*

Grade 10

#4 - Choose many different kinds of books and materials to read	$p < .05$
#6 - Use an encyclopedia	$p < .05$
#10 - Tell in one's own words the main ideas of what has been read	$p < .05$
#11 - Change the rate of reading to fit different kinds of reading materials and different purposes	$p < .05$
#12 - Find information from each of the different parts of the newspaper	$p < .05$

For those objectives given top priority by students and parents there were a number of commonalities. Grade 6 parents and students considered oral reading, recognition of common signs, use of the encyclopedia, and use of the dictionary as top-ranking skills. Grade 8 parents and students agreed that oral reading, use of the dictionary, and use of the encyclopedia were among the top five. Grade 10 parents and students agreed upon use of the dictionary and use of the encyclopedia.

In sum, it can be seen that both parents and teachers in the Fort Gay-Thompson area hold higher priorities for the objectives of reading-language arts instruction than do students. Teachers and parents are generally in agreement with respect to the importance of these objectives.

Comparisons of Ratings on Competency. With the exception perhaps of sixth grade parents, estimations of student competency in relation to the reading objectives described in the Reading Objectives Survey as made by parents seem to be even more unrealistic than those made by the students themselves. Regardless of the reasons why this may be so, the implications of such high expectations for community attitude toward the school and its accomplishments cannot be overlooked. If parents consider their children as being able to accomplish most of the tasks which they regard as being important (and their ratings indicated that they did indeed believe most of these skills to be important) and they find, in fact, their children are not able to perform effectively either upon leaving school or at some point in the child's educational career, the effects of this realization can be quite detrimental for all parties involved, teachers, administrators, parents, and children. This factor must, therefore, be given strong consideration in future decision-making.

TRANSACTIONS

1. CURRICULAR CONTENT AND CONTEXT

INTENTS

General Objectives. A general statement prepared by the Wayne County office includes the following paragraphs which summarize the content and context of the reading-language arts program as planned for in that county.

> The reading program of the Wayne County system is based on guidelines set down by the West Virginia State Department of Education in the Comprehensive Educational Program for the Development of Language Arts. (See Exhibit 9.)
>
> Reading is taught developmentally and sequentially beginning with a meaningful activities program at the kindergarten level. This is followed by a readiness for reading program in grade one which emphasized a strong phonics approach and the development of skills for comprehension. Most skills are taught in grades one, two, and three, reinforced and extended in grades four, five and six...
>
> A program of remedial instruction is available for those children who have difficulties with reading skills. Emphasis is put on helping these students as soon as problems arise.
>
> Testing is done at each grade level yearly to determine progress in reading. Test results are used to group students for reading instruction and for individualizing activities. Each child is taught reading at his own level of achievement.
>
> Teachers are informed regarding instructional methods through in-service sessions. They are provided teaching manuals and encouraged to take college courses in reading instruction which are paid for by the county.
>
> . . .Secondary instruction consists primarily of a total Language Arts program including remedial instruction. Remedial reading classes are available at all high schools. (See Exhibit 7 for the complete statement. A report of conditions related to the remedial program appears as Exhibit 3.)

Implementation is to occur during the 1972-73 school year. Both proposals presented essential and enrichment standards for evaluating the program antecedents and transactions.

These guidelines prepared by the county office afforded the only formal description of intents which could be obtained for the Fort Gay-Thompson schools. If the planned-for content and context of the reading-language arts program for these schools differs from that for the whole of the county no record of such variations was made available.

OBSERVATIONS

Teaching Behavior and Classroom Interaction. Since it was not possible to carry out systematic observations of classroom interactions, an indirect measure of teaching behavior, the Teaching Situation Reaction Test was substituted. This instrument is purported to indicate teachers who prefer "indirect" behavior, defined as behavior which is more accepting, empathizing, and facilitating of student freedom as contrasted with teachers who prefer "direct" behaviors, seen as rejecting, punitive, and freedom-restricting. (See Exhibit 13.)

Means and standard deviations for each group of teachers, primary, intermediate, special, English, and secondary along with totals for elementary, secondary and all are shown in Table 52. Analysis of variance performed to compare means for these groups showed no significant differences among mean scores for all groups.

When the mean score for Fort Gay-Thompson teachers was compared with the mean for a sample of 175 Bowling Green State University teacher education majors, Fort Gay-Thompson teachers indicated significantly more directness ($p < .01$; See Table 53). While this does not demonstrate directness in relation to other groups of practicing teachers, it is suggestive of a trend in this direction.

Additional validation of these observations were made through visitations of selected Fort Gay-Thompson classrooms by the evaluators. Teachers observed did display more direct than indirect behaviors in their verbal interaction as measured by the application of Flanders Interaction Categories.[8] Teacher talk predominated even though the elementary classrooms visited had a higher proportion of student talk than did the secondary classrooms. There were few instances of student-student interaction and very few instances of acceptance or clarification of feeling (Category #1). Most teacher talk was initiatory (Categories 4, 5, or 6) with student talk primarily responsive (Category 8). Especially in the high school classrooms there was a high primacy of teacher initiatory verbal behavior in all areas and a very small proportion of any type of student verbalization except for one class in which students were reading orally from their textbooks. There were also few instances of Category 7 - criticizing or justifying authority; unlike the more common instances to be found in urban and suburban classrooms where children tend to be highly verbal and more resistant of authority.

These findings of direct teacher behavior which reflect very little opportunity for extensive student interaction seem particularly significant in view of the earlier findings in relation to student language patterns. It seems not unlikely that language development might be stifled, or at least not generally encouraged, if students are provided few opportunities to actually practice verbal communication in the classrooms.

---

[8] Ned A. Flanders, Analyzing Teacher Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970, p. 34.

Student Proficiency in Relation to Reading Objectives. The Reading Objectives Survey administered earlier to students, teachers, and parents provided data with respect to preconceived notions about the importance of selected reading objectives as well as estimations of the proficiency of students as perceived by each group. The Reading Diagnostic Survey was later administered to students in grades six, eight, and ten in an effort to measure the actual proficiency of students with respect to these objectives. Students from each of the three grades were randomly assigned to one of the three groups with one of the three forms of the Survey administered to each group. This procedure maintained a randomized approach and yet made it possible to measure eighteen of the twenty objectives without administering a lengthy instrument to any one group.

Unlike the typical achievement test, this instrument is not designed to discriminate according to levels of ability but to ascertain mastery at a particular level. Most items on the instrument were taken from the IOX Instructional Objectives Bank and are considered to be appropriate for utilization at the seventh to eighth grade level. By administering the same instrument to all grade levels, it was thought to be able to ascertain not only the degree of mastery at each level but the differences between levels in terms of proficiency. Each objective selected is also one that has been taught by the end of elementary school in most reading-language arts programs. (See Exhibit 14 for copies of the three forms of the Survey.)

Table 49 shows the means and standard deviations for each of the item scores from the Survey. The percent of mastery represented by these scores is shown in Table 50. Means for each item for each grade level were then compared using analysis of variance to determine if there are significant differences among groups.

Except for five objectives, there were no significant differences among sixth, eighth, and tenth grade students in their ability to perform on the items administered. Differences were obtained for the following objectives:

Objective #2 -	Use other words in a sentence to recognize an unknown word (Here tenth graders were more proficient than sixth or eighth graders.)	$p < .05$
Objective #3 -	Choose many different kinds of materials to read (Again tenth graders show higher scores with a gradual increase reflected from six through eight.)	$p < .01$
Objective #12 -	Find information from the different parts of a newspaper (Eighth graders differ from sixth and tenth graders in that they are less proficient.)	$p < .01$
Objective #15 -	Use the card catalogue (There is a consistent increase in proficiency here from six to ten.)	$p < .05$
Objective #19 -	Use maps, charts, and graphs (Again a steady progression from six through ten.)	$p < .05$

More important perhaps than these differences in terms of interpreting the findings, however, is the fact that for the remaining thirteen objectives that were measured, sixth, eighth, and tenth graders performed basically the same. If this had indicated a mastery achieved at six and retained throughout high school, then certain positive conclusions could possibly be made about the effectiveness of the educational program. But inspection of Table 50 indicates that this is not the case. Only on Objective #24 - sight words - is mastery indicated. For all other objectives there is clearly opportunity for increased proficiency at all levels.

Thus from the data it is more logical to conclude that on the basis of the criterion objectives measured by the survey, students in the sixth, eighth, and tenth grades are more alike than they are different. There is also the possibility that the increase in proficiency that does occur is attributable more to maturation than to any effect of the instructional program *per se*.

Comparison of Proficiency Scores with Ratings of Importance of Objectives. Of the five objectives which teachers consider most important, only two were shown to have generally high mastery levels by students. These are #5 - *Use reading to learn something the student wants to know* and #7 - *Apply effective study skills*, the last of which teachers had regarded as one of the areas of least mastery in their estimation of student competencies.

Of the four[9] objectives which students considered important, three had relatively high mastery levels: #6 - *Use an encyclopedia*; #7 - *Apply effective study skills*, and #17 - *Recognize common signs and symbols*.

Of those objectives teachers considered least important only #16 - *Outline the main ideas from what is read* had a low ranking. Likewise, of those objectives students considered least important only #9 - *Recognize inferences* was extremely low in mastery.

Those items upon which students demonstrated the least proficiency in terms of percent of mastery for that set of tasks included in the *Survey* are as follows:

---

[9] Oral reading was not measured in the *Survey* instrument.

# 9	- Recognize unstated but inferred meanings	27.16%
# 8	- Use clues to letter sounds to recognize unknown words	29.30
#16	- Outline the main ideas from what has been read	33.30
# 3	- Use the dictionary	36.22
# 2	- Use other words in a sentence to recognize an unknown word	40:13
#15	- Use the card catalogue	46.45
#12	- Find information from different parts of the newspaper	47.36

Greatest proficiency was demonstrated with respect to the following items:

#14	- Recognize at sight the most common one hundred words	98.56
# 6	- Use an encyclopedia	77.98
#20	- Separate fact from bias and opinion	75.40
# 5	- Use reading to learn something you want to know	68.84
# 7	- Apply effective study skills	66.90

When these high and low mastery items are compared to teacher estimates of high and low student competencies, it can be seen that there is very little consistency between teacher estimations and student accomplishment. The only objective which teachers rank high and upon which students did score high was #5.

Conversely teachers thought students not able to perform nearly so effectively in separating fact from bias than they were actually able to do. Secondary teachers also thought #7 - study skills and #14 - sight words to be two weak areas, yet students performed well on these two items.

Students themselves were equally inconsistent in being able to predict their own competency. They did rank Objective #5 - Use reading to learn something you want to know as an area of high competency and this did measure high on the Survey, and there was general consistency in Objective #6 - Use of the encyclopedia. However, they thought themselves much more proficient in using the dictionary than they proved to be and much less proficient in recognizing sight words (#14) and separating fact from bias.

Similarly parents' ability to assess student performance realistically is also limited. The only item consistently viewed by parents as indicative of high student competency which was actually associated with a high level of proficiency was again Objective #5 - Use reading to learn something you want to know. Parents were equally inaccurate in predicting a lack of proficiency having selected #20 also as an area of least competency. Tenth grade parents, in fact, as was indicated earlier, demonstrated so little discriminative judgment that little, if anything, can be concluded except that they overrate their children's ability.

In sum, these data concerning student proficiencies indicate a lack of agreement among students, teachers, and parents with respect to the nature of students' abilities to perform in various skill areas. It is, of course, possible that the instrument did not succeed in tapping the true extent of the students' ability to perform. But, at the very least, this suggests the need for more comprehensive and systematic diagnosis of students' level of competence with respect to reading-language arts skills so that the expectancies of all parties concerned can be more realistic and more useful in designing instruction.

What the Survey has revealed more than anything else is the fact that differences in abilities within each of the grade levels is as great as differences between the grade levels thus presenting the very critical question of how the instructional program can be individualized to respond to these differences.

2. INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

In the summary statement referred to previously (Exhibit 7) can be found a description of the nature of instructional materials which have been planned for in the implementation of the system-wide program:

> . . .The foundation program is strengthened through the use of special materials for special needs.
>
> Other supplementary materials available include textbooks, programmed materials, audiovisual materials, library books and resource materials. . .
>
> Include in the reading budget is $2.00 per pupil for library books and approximately $200,000.00 is spent for salaries of special reading teachers.
>
> Wayne County furnishes all the student textbooks.

From the plan for the improvement of the elementary language arts program (Exhibit 9) comes this paragraph with reference to antecedent conditions related to equipment and materials:

> A wide variety of materials is necessary to a program which proposes individualization of instruction. Materials are needed to provide enrichment experiences for the more capable students as well as materials which are specially designed for work with the disadvantaged students. These include textbooks, boxed reading materials, study materials, dictionaries, tapes, records, filmstrips, listening tables and other equipment.

Other specific types of materials to be utilized are then specified in Section F of Enrichment Criteria.

In the plan for improvement of the secondary language arts program (also Exhibit 9), Section D refers to proposed equipment and materials by listing specific materials but makes no statement with respect to the purposes of their utilization. Those listed are current magazines, newspapers, vocabulary study booklets, speech booklets, lecterns, tapes, and duplicating materials. The budget request submitted with this proposal shows a total of $986.80 for the purchase of Scholastic Scope Magazine, vocabulary booklets, and speech books. The Scholastic Magazine is clearly earmarked for schools other than Fort Gay; no mention is made of the dissemination of the other sets of materials.

In this proposal also enrichment criteria suggest an even greater variety of materials is desirable.

The only specific consideration of the antecedent conditions with respect to the availability and utilization of materials for the Fort Gay-Thompson schools as differentiated from those of the county as a whole appeared in the evaluation data presented for the secondary program. Teachers indicated their satisfaction with the English textbooks, the availability of bulletin board materials, and a general feeling that materials were being used efficiently in the language arts classes. They expressed a need for overhead projectors in each classroom and suggested a need to "contemplate library expansion to better serve student body." It is not clear whether this latter suggestion applied to materials and/or physical facilities.

OBSERVATIONS

Use of Instructional Materials. The expression of intent to provide or even the availability of a wide variety of instructional materials does not necessarily indicate the use of such materials.

One method of determining the extent to which materials are being utilized on a school-wide basis is that of surveying teachers. Although self-report is not always accurate, it may at least be indicative of trends or omissions. Teachers K through twelve were therefore asked to complete a 34-item questionnaire in which they indicated to what extent they utilized selected materials using a five-point scale. (See Exhibit 15.) A total of thirty-five teachers returned the questionnaires. Responses were then tabulated for five groups of teachers: primary, intermediate, special, English and secondary. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 56. Analysis of variance was then performed to determine if there were significant differences among the groups in the use of various materials. Table 57 summarizes these findings. Rankings of the incidence of use for each group are also presented in Table 63.

Items reported as used frequently (3.5+) by each of the groups are listed below:

Primary: Teacher-prepared guides (4.55)
A variety of library books (4.42)
Pictures (3.85)
Television (3.71)
Filmstrips (3.71)
Recordings (3.71)
Maps (3.71)
A variety of textbooks (3.57)

Intermediate: Maps (4.10)
A variety of library books (4.00)
Class sets of programmed readers (4.00)
Dictionaries (3.90)
Spellers (3.90)
Pictures (3.90)
A variety of textbooks (3.80)
Teacher-prepared guides (3.80)
Television (3.80)
Filmstrips (3.80)
Charts (3.70)
Usage handbooks (3.60)
Films (3.60)
Class sets of language arts texts (3.60)

Special: Dictionaries (4.20)
Filmstrips (3.60)
Pictures (3.60)

English: A variety of textbooks (4.25)
Newspapers (4.00)
Dictionaries (4.00)
Teacher-prepared guides (4.00)
Up-to-date reading lists (4.00)
A variety of library books (3.75)
Television (3.75)
Periodicals (3.50)
Charts (3.50)

Secondary: None

If these teacher self-reports are valid indicators of their behavior, it would appear that intermediate teachers make much broader use of instructional resources that do any other group. Particularly notable also is the lack of extensive use of a variety of materials by either the special teachers or by secondary teachers other than English. While it would be anticipated that the secondary teachers in particular would not use the more specialized reading-language arts materials included in the survey, it is perhaps critical to note that the highest rankings of any usage is only 3.11 and that all but six other items fall into the "Never" or "Seldom" categories. Those used "Sometimes" by secondary teachers are as follows:

Teacher-prepared guides	(3.11)
A variety of textbooks	(3.00)
Pictures	(3.00)
Television	(2.88)
Filmstrips	(2.88)
Recordings	(2.55)
Maps	(2.50)

Reported as "Never" used were the following kinds of materials which might well service a variety of subject areas other than the reading-language arts:

Vocabulary study texts
Models
Newspapers
Boxed study materials
Reader's Guide
Radio

Items for which there were no significant differences in reported usage among all groups of teachers are as follows:

+ A variety of textbooks
Periodicals
- Pamphlets
- Newspapers
+ Dictionaries
Usage handbooks
- Indexes to fiction and essays

- A Reader's Guide
- A Book of Quotations
+ Teacher-prepared guides
- Class sets of programmed grammar
- Boxed writing materials
- Boxed study materials
- Vocabulary study texts
- A Radio
  Films
+ Filmstrips
  Charts
+ Pictures
- Models

+ = Frequent Rating

- = Seldom Rating

When the means of these responses are examined, it can be seen that consistency in most cases is consistency in not using the item. Those materials that are consistently used by all groups are textbooks, dictionaries, teacher-prepared guides, filmstrips, and pictures. Periodicals, films, and charts apparently have moderate use by all teachers.[10]

These findings strongly suggest that many teachers are not making use of a variety of materials in their instructional practices. Observations of selected classrooms have tended to support this conclusion. Although there was considerably more evidence of a wider deployment of materials in the elementary schools both in terms of availability and variety, fifty percent of the elementary classrooms observed provided no evidence to indicate that children were given consistent and systematic opportunities to interact with a variety of media which could accommodate their different interests, abilities, and learning styles. Observations in secondary classrooms showed this condition to be even more widespread in the high school. Except for the remedial reading classroom there was little evidence that a varied and personalized approach to matching media to students was being undertaken and even in this setting students were generally utilizing only structured, programmed sets of written materials. It may be that accessibility to materials in the high school is more limited, but the classroom observations made point strongly to the conclusion that the resources available are not being utilized to their fullest potential.

---

[10] Item #7 - Usage handbook may have been interpreted differently by different groups and therefore the meaning of the responses cannot be interpreted.

As indicated in earlier sections, there seems to be an undue emphasis upon teacher verbalization without adequate provision for more concrete and varied experiences which could be provided through the use of other materials than the textbook or supplementary written materials. This is particularly true in the content areas but applies to the reading-language arts program as well.

Textbook Analysis. Using the Fry Readability Guide and the comprehension levels as described by Barrett (See Exhibit 16), analyses of selected textbooks from the second, fourth, sixth, eighth, and tenth grade levels were performed. Findings for each of the texts are reported in Table 57 with a summary of the data for all the texts presented in Table 60.

At the elementary level it can be noted that the texts for grades two and six are at or below assigned grade levels in terms of readability. The text for grade four is one year beyond grade level.

At the secondary level, the readability factor shows relatively good control with at least a two-year range between actual and assigned grade level for all English/reading texts. However, in the social studies area, it can be seen that the text selected for the tenth grade is written at a tenth grade readability level; thus, it can be anticipated that it will be far too difficult for many of the students.

Throughout the grades the emphasis in most of the texts is upon the knowledge (literal) level. Inference (Level 2) does receive considerable attention in the Focus text and guidebook for grade 8 and the Think Critically components of the fourth and sixth grade materials are especially strong in Evaluation (Level 3). These two also give notable attention to Level 4 - Appreciative Response which, it is shown, are omitted or only minimally attended to in other texts.

These findings appear to be not only critical in relation to a number of basic principles of instruction and learning but antithetical to the intents expressed in the curricular plan for the Wayne County schools. For example, if the intent of the program design is to seek to individualize instruction, then attention must be given to the inappropriateness of these materials for many learners.

Direct observations of classrooms indicated the presence of numerous supplementary materials which were presumably written on a variety of reading levels in the elementary school in particular, but these same observations also revealed that many teachers are still committed to a singular approach to teaching reading. At the secondary level, except for the adaptations entailed in designating students as remedial and thus assigning them to special instructional groups, there is little evidence that little other than the basic texts were being utilized as the primary mode of instruction.

Furthermore, the strong emphasis upon the knowledge level in these materials and the relative neglect of higher levels of comprehension could be directly related to the observations recorded in previous sections which indicate that students' language usage tends to be highly literal, that only a few examples of inferential, evaluative, and appreciative language were identified in the language sample analysis, and that sentence structure as observed both in this analysis and in the classroom setting tends to be brief, simple, and generally immature.

Findings with respect to student competencies also indicate limited proficiency on items calling for the recognition of inferences and the use of context clues. It was also noted in scoring these instruments that although many responses were correct in relation to the skill being assessed, the nature of the response itself was unelaborate and illustrative of the more simple structural patterns.

It would appear that if instruction in the reading-language arts is to have an effect in promoting more complex language behavior, materials must be selected and utilized which encourage students to perform at higher levels of language facility but do so within the framework of an initial level appropriate for each student.

3. PHYSICAL PLANT

INTENTS

At the county level no record or information was provided which gave attention to antecedent conditions relative to the physical plants within which each educational program is housed. The proposals for the improvement of the language arts program omitted this consideration completely except for the few evaluative comments which were attached to the secondary proposal. Specifically, Fort Gay teachers noted a lack of classroom and conference room space, the need for more bulletin boards, and for a stage which could be used by all members of the department.

OBSERVATIONS

The Fort Gay-Thompson area contains three separate schools each of which is housed in several buildings.

The Thompson Elementary School utilizes two buildings, a six-room block structure and a more recently constructed "temporary" building consisting of two classrooms. A lunchroom, office, and small conference room also occupy the main building. Classrooms in both buildings were relatively well kept, heated, lighted, ventilated. They reflected different degrees of attractiveness attributable to the differences among the teachers who occupy the rooms and arrange them differently. Two classes had less than functionally adequate quarters; and all-purpose activity area had been converted to use as classroom space. The external setting for these buildings is naturally pleasant with the wooded hills offering a natural background. However, much of the ground area immediately adjacent to the building lacked sod or appropriate man-made cover and mud and dirt presented a continual problem with respect to cleanliness.

The Fort Gay elementary school is housed in three buildings and also utilizes a separate building as a cafeteria in cooperation with the high school. The newest of the classroom buildings is the most adequately provided for with respect to heat, lighting, and ventilation. It also has the advantage of being centered within a grass-covered area. A second, brick structure consisting of six classrooms stands to one side of the cafeteria building. It appeared to have adequate heating, but ventilation and lighting were poor. The building also lacked pleasing aesthetic qualities in its general appearance although individual teachers have attempted to improve upon this by decorating their rooms and parts of the hallway attractively. The third building, situated on the opposite side of the cafeteria building, contains the remaining classrooms, the principal's office, an auditorium, an art room, several storage areas, and the offices of the EDPA School Development staff. The building is antiquated, in very poor repair, and deficient with respect to adequate heating, lighting, ventilation, and sanitation. It has few, if any, redeeming aesthetic qualities and efforts of teachers to beautify their rooms have made little, if any, impact upon the generally deplorable state of the building.

The cafeteria building functions as kitchen and dining room but provides little in terms of pleasant and attractive dining environment.

Between and around the cafeteria building and the oldest of the classroom buildings is an unpaved and largely barren area which is used both as a playground and a parking lot. Not only is this hazardous but the constant tracking of mud and dirt into the school buildings create almost insurmountable cleaning problems.

The Fort Gay High School utilizes classrooms in four buildings; one of which houses the shop, another a band room, and a third a gymnasium. The main two-and-a-half story building contains classrooms, an auditorium, library and offices. It appears to have adequate heating and ventilation but halls and some rooms are dark and rather dingy. The library is a long rectangular room with rows of tables and chairs rather than study carrels or clusters of study areas. Books are mainly located on shelves around the perimeter of the room. The exterior of the main building is relatively austere and though it sits within a generous grounds area, little has been done to enhance the surroundings with attractive plantings. The plant as a whole affords minimal support for function with little attention to aesthetic quality.

In sum, the several physical plants of the Fort Gay-Thompson schools are not only less than adequate functionally, but seriously deficient in aesthetic quality. This becomes especially critical when viewed in relation to the numerous studies which have shown the relationship between physical environment and human behavior.[11]

---

[11] See for example The Harvard Educational Review 39 (1969). "Architecture and Education."

4. SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

INTENTS

As indicated previously, Fort Gay-Thompson schools are members of the Wayne County System. The county staff includes two supervisors who are assigned to the reading-language arts area, one in elementary, the other in secondary. Each of the three schools has its own full-time principal.

No statement of role expectations has been prepared to make explicit the responsibilities of each member of the county and school staffs, nor was an organizational chart provided to clarify the relationships among the various roles. Intents in this respect, therefore, remain unspecified.

School data displayed in Section 3 (See Exhibit 9) suggest that the supervisors have a primary role in program development and evaluation and that teachers from individual schools provide some input. Principals within each of the three schools showed varying degrees of involvement in the reading-language arts program but this may be a function of their interpretation of role rather than outgrowth of any planned-for behaviors.

Also unspecified were the areas in which and the extent to which individual schools may exercise autonomy with respect to program development, implementation, evaluation, and improvement.

Informal communication channels within the system exist but also have not been given systematic attention as antecedent conditions even though they may be quite powerful in affecting transactions and outcomes.

OBSERVATIONS

In an effort to determine what role occupants within the system perceive to be the patterns of relationships among roles and the loci of decision-making responsibility, with respect to the reading-language arts program, the Decision Point Analysis was utilized. This instrument (See Exhibit 10) contains twenty decision items which relate to the organizational structure associated with the reading-language arts program. Respondents are asked to indicate (1) Who makes the decision, and (2) What other persons participate in making this decision. Responses to these questions from 20 elementary teachers, 26 secondary teachers, and 9 administrators and supervisors are summarized in Table 47. Responses from six teachers could not be used because items were either incomplete or inadequately marked.

In Table 48 frequencies have been converted to percentages so that items can be compared despite the different number of respondents in each group.

Inspection of Table 48 indicates that there are wide variations within each group with respect to identification of the primary loci of decision-making for each item. However, it is possible to note several items for which there is substantial agreement within each group and between groups.

At least 50 percent of the elementary teachers indicated that they perceived the following role occupants to have primary responsibility for these specific decisions:

Principal:

# 3 The decision on the priority for the use of rooms and other areas for the purpose of reading-language arts related activities.

#13 The decision on the rules governing student conduct.

Special Subject Supervisor:

#1 The decision on the selection of curriculum problems in reading and language arts for study.

#11 The decision on the adequacy of teacher performance in the reading-language arts area.

#14 The decision on the selection of textbooks in reading-language arts.

#15 The decision on the procedure for obtaining instructional supplies for the reading-language arts.

#16 The decision on how to evaluate the reading-language arts curriculum.

#17 The decision on the activities for in-service development of the staff in reading-language arts.

Board of Education:

#19 The decision on the assignment of teaching and non-teaching loads.

#20 The decision on who will participate in the formulation of the school budget.

Teacher:

#10 The decision on the retention of pupils.

#18 The decision on the practices for assigning homework in reading-language arts.

At least 50 percent of the secondary teachers agree with respect to the primary locus of responsibility for the following decision items:

Principal:

# 3 The decision on the priority for the use of rooms and other areas for the purpose of reading-language arts related activities.

#13 The decision on the rules governing pupil conduct.

#19 The decision on the assignment of teaching and non-teaching loads.

Special Subject Supervisor:

# 1 The decision on the selection of curriculum problems in reading and language arts for study.

# 8 The decision on the selection of teachers for participation in experimental instructional programs in reading-language arts.

#11 The decision on the adequacy of teacher performance in the reading-language arts area.

#15 The decision on the procedure for obtaining instructional supplies for reading-language arts.

#17 The decision on the activities for in-service development of the staff in reading-language arts.

Board of Education:

# 7 The decision on the content of pupils' cumulative records.

#12 The decision of the regulations concerning lesson plans for reading-language arts.

#20 The decision on who will participate in the formulation of the budget.

Teacher:

#10 The decision on the retention of pupils.

#18 The decision of the practices for assigning homework in reading-language arts.

Over 50 percent of the administrators and supervisors selected the following items with respect to primary loci of decision-making.

Principal:

# 2 The decision on the ways to group pupils by classes.

3 The decision on the priority for the use of rooms and other areas for the purpose of reading-language arts related activities.

#11 The decision on the adequacy of teacher performance in the reading-language arts area.

#13 The decision on the rules governing pupil behavior.

#19 The decision of the assignment of teaching and non-teaching loads.

Special Subject Supervisor:

#16 The decision on how to evaluate the reading-language arts curriculum.

Board of Education:

#20 The decision on who will participate in the formulation of the budget.

Teacher:

#20 The decision on the retention of pupils.

There is a limited extent of congruency between groups of teachers and the administrators/supervisors group. However, the principal is perceived by the majority of teachers and administrators/supervisors (82 percent) as making the decision on the priority for the use of rooms and other areas and by 71 percent of the total number of respondents (teachers, administrators and supervisors) as making the decision on the rules governing pupil conduct.

The teacher is seen by both groups (68 percent of all respondents) as making the decision on the retention of pupils and the decision on the practices for assigning homework (80 percent).

Elementary and secondary teachers generally agree that the special subjects supervisor makes the decision on the selection of curriculum problems for study (83 percent), the decision on the adequacy of teacher performance (55 percent), the decision on the procedure for obtaining instructional supplies (59 percent), the decision on how to evaluate the reading-language arts curriculum (52 percent), and the decision on the activities for in-service development of the staff (67 percent).

Table 48 shows the responses to the second question "What other persons participate in this decision?". Frequencies have been converted to percentages to eliminate the differences due to group size. When these percentages were totaled to obtain a score for all items for each of the possible decision-points both elementary and secondary teachers' perceptions of decision-making showed the special subject supervisor and the principal with the greatest number of decision-making opportunities. However, elementary teachers assigned teachers a greater extent of participation than did secondary teachers.

In contrast, administrators and supervisors regarded the principal and the teacher as having more involvement than the supervisor and also indicated much less involvement by the Board of Education than did either of the teacher groups.

Three major factors have appeared through this analysis which may be critical to the improvement of the reading-language arts program.

First, despite the existence of consistencies in the way in which any one group tends to view the loci of decision-making, there is general inconsistency among groups with respect to where the locus of many decision items lie. This seems particularly true with respect to the role of the supervisor and the principal in relation to curricular and evaluation decisions. Until sources of authority and responsibility are clarified, it can be anticipated that there will be continuing conflict and inaccurate communication which can be expected to have detrimental effects upon program development and implementation.

Secondly, in the estimation of teachers, the supervisor is a critical decision-maker. Whether in fact this is the case has not been ascertained, but it does suggest that the person who fulfills this role has the potential of becoming an effective instructional leader provided the supervisor is accorded the power to do what the teachers expect. Should this not be the case, the supervisor could easily become the scapegoat for the system.

Finally, it can be noted that teachers see themselves as being relatively powerless in terms of decision-making. This tends to reinforce the findings earlier which indicated that teachers are more externally oriented and therefore see themselves as being controlled more than as controlling their environment. Without a feeling of efficacy with respect to their ability to influence the curriculum, it seems unlikely that significant changes in teaching behavior can be expected.

In sum, the findings from the Decision-Point Analysis Survey suggest strongly the need to examine more thoroughly the organizational structure of the district and the Fort Gay-Thompson schools in order to adjust those factors which may be critical in relation to the improvement of the curriculum in general and the reading-language arts program in particular.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An evaluation of the reading-language arts program of the Fort Gay-Thompson Schools was conducted during the 1972-73 school year. Data for this evaluation were drawn from two major sources; Intents, the planned-for conditions, behaviors, and effects, and Observations, surroundings or events observed in a direct or personal way by the evaluator.

Two categories of information were investigated within each of these sources: Antecedents, conditions existing prior to teaching and learning and Transactions, a succession of engagements between actors and actors or actors and artifacts which comprises the educational process.

Specific antecedent conditions which were viewed by the evaluators as most critical to the effectiveness of the reading-language arts program and selected for study were (1) Student Characteristics, (2) Teacher Characteristics, and (3) Parent Characteristics. Selected transactions were (1) Curricular Content and Context, (2) Instructional Materials, (3) Physical Plant, and (4) School Organization.

Findings which have been discussed in detail in the previous sections are summarized here.

ANTECEDENTS

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Intents. Prior to this evaluation little systematic attention seems to have been given to student characteristics other than that derived from standardized achievement tests. Attitudes, values, goals of the student population had apparently not been considered, except perhaps informally in the design of the program.

Observations. Observations of students in the course of the evaluation yielded these major findings with respect to their goals and attitudes:

1. In the primary grades, students view reading primarily as form rather than function; i.e., they pay attention more to sounding and looking like someone whom they consider a good reader rather than paying attention to what reading does - provide understanding, enjoyment, a way to becoming an independent learner.

2. Elementary students consider reading (as defined by the specific objectives stated in the _Reading Objectives Survey_) as more important than do secondary students.

3. All students tend to agree on the _relative_ importance of the 20 objectives included in the _Survey_.

4. When ratings of all students in upper elementary and in secondary are combined, the emphasis upon form is still shown to exist. Students ranked oral reading as the most important of all the objectives. The four next highest rankings were more functional but appear to be related primarily to function in terms of school tasks (use of dictionary, encyclopedia, and applying effective study skills), with only one clearly related to the broader aspects of reading (recognizing common signs and symbols).

5. Students' attitudes toward school and self become significantly _less_ positive as grade level increases.

6. Students' language tends to be primarily literal with some interpretive and evaluative usage but includes little figurative usage, tentative suppositions, or generalizations.

7. Students' language patterns are relatively uncomplex with the Loban patterns 1, 2, and 10 predominating. (These are subject-predicate; subject-predicate-direct object; and incomplete.)

TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

Intents. Teachers in the Fort Gay-Thompson area in the past have been less well-educated and less well-paid than are teachers in the State in general. There is no evidence to indicate upon what set of criteria employment is based; many teachers still have temporary certification. The present EPPA School-Community Project does include a major component designed to improve teachers' competencies through provision of course work and related experiences.

Observations. Findings derived from observations made during the study are summarized below:

1. All teachers are highly consistent in their ranking of the importance of the 20 objectives from the Reading Objectives Survey.

2. All teachers are highly consistent in their rankings of the relative importance of these objectives as well.

3. Teachers regard using reading to learn something the student wants to know as the most important objective; telling main ideas from what has been read and using context clues are next in importance.

4. Teachers ranked reading orally as the least important objective.

5. Elementary teachers have generally higher expectations for their students than do secondary students as measured by their estimations of student proficiency for each objective.

6. Over 50 percent of the elementary teachers reported that they do not teach the use of the newspaper and the card catalogue or recognition of sight words and common signs or symbols.

7. Over 50 percent of the secondary English teachers reported they do not teach use of the newspaper or recognition of sight words and common signs and symbols.

8. Over 50 percent of the secondary teachers reported they do not teach oral reading, phonics, recognition of inferences, sight words, use of the card catalogue, or choosing reading as a preferred activity.

9. One hundred percent of the teachers indicated they teach telling the main ideas of what has been read and 90 percent indicated they teach students to use reading to learn something the student wants to know.

10. Elementary teachers and students generally agree on the importance of most of the reading objectives.

11. Secondary teachers tend to rank objectives higher in importance than do students.

12. Teachers have lower expectations of student performance than do students but neither group is very accurate in assessing proficiency on specific objectives. Secondary teachers are the most accurate in doing this, but even so, they overrated student performance on seven objectives and underrated student performance on nine.

13. Teachers tend to be external in their expectancies for control of reinforcement; i.e., they perceive events more as under the control of powerful others or unpredictable due to the complexity of forces surrounding them. If the assumptions underlying this instrument are valid, this would suggest that they are less responsive to positive or negative reinforcement than persons who are internally oriented.

PARENT CHARACTERISTICS

Intents. No data could be secured to indicate that any systematic attempt has been made to consider or include parents values, attitudes, or goals in the planning or implementing of curricular events in the reading-language arts.

Observations. Data secured through distribution of a questionnaire similar to that completed by teachers and students provided the following generalizations with respect to parental goals and expectations:

1. Parents of primary children (grades 2 and 4) scored lower on the Concept of Reading Inventory than did teachers but significantly higher than did students. Their responses thus suggest more emphasis upon the form of reading than upon function and enjoyment than indicated by teachers.

2. Parents and teachers generally agreed upon the importance of the 20 reading objectives included in the Survey. Parents thought three objectives more important; teachers thought two objectives more important than did parents. (See page 27 for the specific areas of disagreement.)

3. Parents consider recognition of common signs and use of the dictionary and encyclopedia as the most important objectives.

4. Parents consider use of the newspaper as the least important objective.

5. Parents of sixth grade students and elementary teachers regard using reading to learn something the student wants to know and use of the dictionary as two of the top five objectives in importance, but do not agree upon the other three.

6. Parents of eighth grade students and secondary teachers regard using reading to learn something the student wants to know as one of the top five priorities in reading, but do not agree upon the other four.

7. Parents of tenth grade students and secondary teachers regard telling the main idea of what was read as one of the five most important objectives, but do not agree upon the other four.

8. Parents and students disagree in their ratings of the importance of objectives in numerous instances, but in all but one of these cases parents consider the objective more important than do the students.

9. Parents' expectations for their children are higher than are the expectations of teachers for the students or the expectations for students for themselves.

10. Parents are unable to discriminate well among objectives with respect to students' proficiencies and tend to rate competency on all objectives unrealistically high. Differences in ratings are associated more with increase in grade level than with any other criterion.

TRANSACTIONS

CURRICULAR CONTENT AND CONTEXT

Intents. Curricular plans for the Wayne County Schools indicated above all the intention to individualize the reading-language arts program. This was to be accomplished through varying both content and instruction to suit the needs and interests of the individual learner.

Presumably teachers were in agreement with this philosophy and had the opportunity to engage in the development of the intents for the program and in the selection of materials and resources to be used in the implementation of the program.

Observations. Observations made during the study with respect to actual classroom instructional events were limited due to the need to refrain from having teachers feel threatened by these observations. Therefore, some indirect and informal measures had to be employed in assessing classroom interactions.

A summary of the findings related to the curricular content and context are summarized below:

1. Teachers in the Fort Gay-Thompson area tend to be more direct than indirect in their teaching behavior.

2. The quantity of student verbalization in the classroom context is minimal; the quantity of teachers' verbalization is proportionally much higher. This holds true to an even greater extent in the secondary classroom.

3. Students verbalizations are primarily literal and their sentence structure simple.

4. Students demonstrate highest proficiency (above 65 percent) in relation to the following objectives included on the Reading Objectives Survey: recognition of sight words, use of the encyclopedia, separating fact from bias, using reading to learn something the student wants to know, and applying effective study skills.

5. Students demonstrated the least proficiency (below 50 percent) in relation to the following objectives included on the Reading Objectives Survey: recognizing inferences, outlining main ideas, using phonetic clues, the dictionary, context clues, the card catalogue, and the newspaper.

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Intents. The curricular intents of the Wayne County Schools expressly state that the instructional program in the reading-language arts is to be supported by a wide variety of materials of different levels and types to make possible the individualization of instruction at all levels for all students.

Observations. Observations made during the study yielded the following findings with respect to the types and utilization of instructional materials:

1. Both the Fort Gay and Thompson elementary schools have available a wide variety of supportive resources, hard and software.

2. The secondary school has fewer resources available in software than do the elementary schools. The most extensive supply of materials particularly designated for reading-language arts was that provided for the remedial reading program. Secondary English teachers were relying primarily upon textbooks.

3. Certain materials are seldom used by teachers. These are pamphlets, newspapers, indexes, guides, books of quotations, programmed grammars, boxed writing materials, boxed study materials, vocabulary study texts, radios, and models.

4. Basic textbooks in the reading-language arts area are suitable in readability for those students reading at or above grade level.

5. The secondary social studies text is suitable in readability only for the above-average student.

6. Textbooks place most emphasis upon the knowledge level; some exclude or only briefly address the higher levels of behavior; inference, evaluation, and appreciative response.

Intents. No data could be secured to determine to what extent plans exist with respect to the physical plant which houses the curricular events and with which pupils and teachers interact in the course of these events. Some attention apparently has been given to future planning in relation to the recently constructed pod which is part of the Fort Gay complex and the expansion of facilities at the high school, but whether this is part of any systematic, long-range design related to improving the curriculum remains questionable.

Observations. A summary of the conclusions made from observations of the physical setting is presented below:

1. One of the three Fort Gay elementary buildings is direly in need of either renovation or replacement. Spatially as well as aesthetically it provides a very inadequate setting for instruction, particularly the individualization of instruction.

2. Maintenance is a problem in all the elementary schools, but particularly the Fort Gay schools because of the state of the grounds surrounding the buildings.

3. The Thompson school still lacks adequate space to properly accommodate all its students. Two classes are now being held in the all-purpose area.

4. The Fort Gay High School is relatively well-kept, but classroom space is inadequate and often ill-suited to the kind of activity most desirable to implement an effective reading-language arts program. Also, teachers must frequently move from building to building or room to room thus complicating the utilization of materials and the possibilities for prearranging the learning

setting.

5. All the physical plants with the possible exception of the most recent additions to the Fort Gay and Thompson schools lend themselves most readily to a graded, group oriented view of instruction rather than to an individualized, integrated approach. This is not to say that new types of school plants are required or even bring about curricular change, but rather to say that curricular designs which are intended to encourage individualization entail a different conceptualization of the utilization of space than do those based upon a "traditional" model.

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

Intents. No description of the organizational structure of the Wayne County system or of the Fort Gay-Thompson school district defining either line or staff relationships or role expectations was secured; thus, no discussion of intents can be included.

Observations. Observations made primarily through the use of the Decision-Point Analysis completed by teachers, supervisors, and administrators did indicate something of this structure as it is perceived by the various role incumbents.

1. Teachers tend to agree among themselves on the loci of authority for many curricular decisions more than do administrators and supervisors.

2. Teachers consider the special subject supervisor as the prime decision-maker with respect to most items dealing with instruction and evaluation.

3. Teachers perceive themselves as having very little primary responsibility for decisions.

4. Administrators and supervisors perceive the principal as having more of a role in making instructional and evaluational decisions than do teachers.

5. Supervisors see themselves as much less powerful than others see them.

6. When all decisions are considered in terms of those participating in the decisions, the principal is seen to have the highest percentage of participation overall; others in order are special subject supervisor, teacher, board of education, department head, and other.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations presented here are based upon judgments of the evaluators and as such may or may not be consistent with the standards which will be applied by the decision-makers in the Fort Gay Thompson Schools. It is hoped, however, that those decision-makers will examine their priorities very carefully and make every attempt to base their choice of action upon the most educationally justifiable standards.

The set of recommendations is presented in two parts corresponding to the two basic categories of information which were tapped in the evaluation. It should be understood that the line between antecedents and transactions is not always clearly drawn; therefore, there will be overlapping considerations between the two. Also, it recognized that some recommendations will require careful planning and preparation prior to their implementation; others can be initiated more immediately.

ANTECEDENT CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED

1. Administrative and supervisory personnel should actively provide the leadership and support necessary to encourage each school staff to reexamine its curriculum in general and the reading-language arts program in particular and work to secure the resources necessary to effect those changes agreed upon as necessary to the improvement of instruction.

2. If individualization is actually to be the philosophy which characterizes the reading-language arts program, then every effort should be made to employ teachers shown to be committed to and competent in this approach.

3. Teachers should be aided in becoming self-evaluative; that is, they should be encouraged to examine the consequences of their actions and be expected to take the initiative in identifying areas of needed change or improvement in the instructional program.

4. Supervisors should be given primary responsibility for working with teachers in helping them become self-evaluative by providing alternatives whereby teachers can secure non-threatening feedback and can work cooperatively with other teachers to find alternative solutions to common problems.

5. A systematic endeavor should be undertaken to determine those specific reading and language arts skills which might appropriately be considered as basic to the needs of most learners in the Fort Gay-Thompson Schools so that a diagnostic approach can be designed by teachers which will minimize the possibility that basic skills may be omitted in the course of the educational program.

6. A careful study should be made of the presumed and actual county and school organizational structure for the purpose of making changes which will result in (a) more effective two-way communication, (b) more clearly identified, visible sources of decision-points, and (c) increasing involvement in and responsibility for curricular and instructional decision-making by teachers.

7. Both students and parents should be encouraged to become more directly involved in curricular planning. Although professional educators should continue to take leadership in this area, decisions should not be arrived at unilaterally by professional personnel nor should judgments about the schools be made only by the professional staff.

8. Attention should be given by teachers and administrators alike to the improvement of the physical setting. If major renovations in the school plants are not immediately feasible, then efforts should be made to improve upon the present utilization of space to the fullest extent possible using whatever means can be made available.

9. Each school faculty should undertake a serious self-study which gives thorough attention to the different approaches which may be taken to individualization, and if it decides to adopt such an approach develop a plan to move steadily and realistically in that direction.

TRANSACTIONS RECOMMENDED

1. In whatever ways they can presently implement, teachers should adjust their instructional strategies and use of materials to fit more appropriately the differences in abilities and learning styles of individual students.

2. Although teachers ranked oral reading low in importance, students see it as highly important. Classroom events should be examined

more systematically at all levels and in all areas to determine if undue emphasis is being placed upon this behavior.

3. Teachers in all areas should learn to employ more systematically questioning and discussion methods which go beyond the knowledge level.

4. More attention should be given by teachers to structuring reading-language arts events that are functional for personal and social use rather than functional primarily in relation to school expectations.

5. Teachers should become more familiar with the content of various instructional materials they are using in terms of their readability and comprehension levels so that they can more skillfully adjust materials to learners and select materials more appropriately to achieve desired outcomes.

6. A variety of measures should be undertaken to encourage quantitatively and qualitatively a greater proportion of student verbal communication in all classrooms.

7. Textbooks used in the content areas in the secondary schools should be examined to determine their appropriateness for the learners who are being asked to utilize them.

8. Until such time as broader curricular revisions can be made, secondary English teachers should be encouraged to utilize a greater variety of media and materials to enrich and expand the textbook.

9. Teachers in the content areas in the secondary schools should be encouraged to become more aware of and able to apply means for improving the communication skills of students within the framework of their own specialized areas.

10. Students should be given more options in choosing both what is to be learned and how they may utilize their school time.

11. An attempt should be made to elicit more direct community-school interaction both in terms of bringing members of the community into the school and extending the school into the community.

12. More attention should be given to the affective components of learning at all levels. Specifically, the lessening in positive attitudes of students toward school and self should be viewed with extreme concern and given immediate attention by all the professional staff. All curricular events should include this consideration, but in addition specific activities should be selected which are designed primarily for building more positive attitudes on behalf of individual students.

Table 1.

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Reading Objectives[a]

	Grade 6 Students' Rating		Grade 8 Students' Rating		Grade 10 Students' Rating		All Students' Rating	
Objective	$\overline{X}$	S	$\overline{X}$	S	$\overline{X}$	S	$\overline{X}$	S
1	4.272	0.631	4.292	0.873	4.048	0.835	4.193	0.813
2	3.954	0.785	3.560	0.867	3.829	0.863	3.750	0.856
3	4.136	0.774	4.219	0.962	4.073	0.984	4.144	0.928
4	3.454	0.880	3.512	0.925	3.512	0.951	3.500	0.903
5	4.000	1.112	3.951	0.893	4.000	0.707	3.980	0.870
6	4.227	0.972	4.146	0.909	3.829	0.891	4.038	0.923
7	4.227	0.685	4.219	0.821	3.853	1.215	4.076	0.982
8	4.090	0.811	3.585	0.805	3.536	0.951	3.673	0.886
9	3.090	1.019	3.024	0.935	3.243	0.969	3.125	0.962
10	3.863	0.774	3.634	0.887	3.658	0.794	3.692	0.825
11	3.909	1.230	3.756	0.994	3.341	0.964	3.625	1.053
12	3.454	1.056	3.097	0.888	3.073	0.877	3.163	0.925
13	3.590	1.007	3.560	1.096	3.658	1.039	3.605	1.046
14	3.590	0.959	2.682	1.082	2.731	1.025	2.894	1.087
15	3.636	1.002	4.024	0.790	3.585	1.071	3.769	0.967
16	3.590	0.959	3.609	0.586	3.512	0.951	3.567	0.821
17	4.227	1.192	3.975	1.193	4.121	0.979	4.086	1.107
18	3.227	1.192	3.634	1.112	3.585	1.117	3.528	1.131
19	4.272	0.767	3.853	0.823	3.804	0.872	3.923	0.844
20	3.954	0.722	3.463	0.809	3.341	0.854	3.519	0.835

[a] Rating of 5=very important, 1=very unimportant

Table 2.

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Reading Objectives[a]

	Elementary Teachers' Rating		Secondary English Teachers' Rating		Secondary Teachers' (Other) Rating		Secondary Teachers' (All) Rating		All Teachers' Rating	
Objective	$\overline{X}$	S	$\overline{X}$	S	$\overline{X}$	S	$\overline{X}$	S	$\overline{X}$	S
1	3.600	1.140	4.250	0.957	3.615	1.043	3.764	1.032	3.727	1.031
2	4.600	0.547	4.000	-0.0	4.384	0.869	4.294	0.771	4.363	0.726
3	4.600	0.547	4.000	0.816	4.230	0.832	4.176	0.808	4.272	0.767
4	3.800	0.447	4.000	0.816	3.846	0.987	3.882	0.927	3.863	0.833
5	4.800	0.447	4.500	0.577	4.615	0.650	4.588	0.618	4.636	0.581
6	4.200	0.836	3.750	0.500	4.000	0.816	3.941	0.747	4.000	0.755
7	4.400	0.547	4.500	0.577	4.538	0.660	4.529	0.624	4.500	0.597
8	4.600	0.547	4.000	-0.0	3.846	0.688	3.882	0.600	4.045	0.653
9	4.200	0.447	4.000	0.816	3.769	0.832	3.823	0.808	3.909	0.750
10	4.600	0.547	4.750	0.500	4.538	0.660	4.588	0.618	4.590	0.590
11	3.600	0.547	3.750	0.957	3.846	0.898	3.823	0.882	3.772	0.812
12	3.800	0.447	3.250	0.500	3.923	0.862	3.764	0.831	3.772	0.751
13	4.000	1.000	3.500	0.577	3.769	0.832	3.705	0.771	3.772	0.812
14	3.400	1.140	2.750	1.500	3.384	1.386	3.235	1.393	3.272	1.315
15	3.000	0.707	3.750	0.500	3.846	0.987	3.823	0.882	3.336	0.902
16	4.000	0.707	3.000	-0.0	4.076	0.759	3.823	0.808	3.863	0.774
17	3.400	0.547	3.500	0.577	4.307	0.854	4.117	0.857	3.954	0.843
18	4.000	-0.0	4.000	0.816	3.615	0.869	3.705	0.848	3.772	0.751
19	4.400	0.547	4.000	-0.0	4.461	0.660	4.352	0.606	4.363	0.581
20	3.800	0.447	3.750	0.957	4.230	0.725	4.117	0.781	4.045	0.722

[a] Rating of 5=very important, 1=very unimportant.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Reading Objectives[a]

Objective	Grade 6 Parents' Rating(N=29) $\overline{X}$	Grade 6 Parents' Rating(N=29) SD	Grade 8 Parents' Rating(N=18) $\overline{X}$	Grade 8 Parents' Rating(N=18) SD	Grade 10 Parents' Rating(N=14) X	Grade 10 Parents' Rating(N=14) SD
1	4.413	0.6822	4.105	0.875	4.142	0.864
2	3.827	0.8891	3.736	0.871	3.785	0.801
3	4.517	0.574	4.421	0.606	4.500	0.650
4	4.103	0.816	3.894	0.936	4.214	0.801
5	4.413	0.627	4.473	0.611	4.000	0.877
6	4.344	0.669	4.526	0.611	4.500	0.650
7	4.206	0.773	3.789	1.084	3.785	0.974
8	3.965	0.731	3.842	0.764	3.714	0.726
9	3.724	0.959	3.789	0.854	3.785	0.425
10	4.206	0.726	3.947	1.025	4.285	0.726
11	3.655	0.897	3.421	0.768	4.000	0.679
12	3.689	0.929	3.315	0.945	3.714	0.825
13	4.013	0.859	3.684	0.749	3.928	0.828
14	4.103	0.976	3.736	1.147	3.642	1.215
15	3.827	0.804	3.473	0.964	4.000	0.960
16	4.172	0.710	3.947	0.848	3.785	0.699
17	4.586	0.682	4.315	1.056	4.500	0.650
18	3.862	0.875	3.578	0.961	3.428	0.646
19	3.862	0.742	3.842	0.834	3.928	0.828
20	4.103	0.772	3.736	0.805	3.857	0.770

Table 4.

Significant Differences Between Means
on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 1 - Read aloud in a clear voice with good expression and proper speed.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\overline{X}$	N	t
Teachers - All	82.000	328.000	3.727	22	-2.319
Students - All	436.000	1896.000	4.192	104	($p < .05$)

Table 5.

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 2 - Use other words in a sentence to recognize an unknown word.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\overline{X}$	N	t
Teachers - All Secondary	73.000	323.000	4.294	17	3.021
Students - Grade 8	146.000	550.000	3.560	41	($p < .01$)
Teachers - All	96.000	430.000	4.363	22	3.129
Students - All	390.000	1538.000	3.750	104	($p < .01$)

Table 6

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 4 - Select a wide variety of materials to read.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\overline{X}$	N	t
Parents - Grade 6	119.000	507.000	4.103	29	2.665
Students - Grade 6	76.000	276.000	3.454	22	($p < .05$)
Parents - Grade 10	59.000	257.000	4.214	14	2.432
Students _ Grade 10	144.000	542.000	3.512	41	($p < .05$)

Table 7

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 5 - Use reading to learn something the student desires to know.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\bar{X}$	N	t
Teachers - All Secondary	78.000	364.000	4.588	17	2.680
Students - Grade 8	162.000	672.000	3.951	41	($p < .05$)
Teachers - All Secondary	78.000	364.000	4.588	17	2.985
Students - Grade 10	164.000	676.000	4.000	41	($p < .05$)
Teachers - All	102.000	480.000	4.636	22	3.373
Students - All	414.000	1726.000	3.980	104	($p < .001$)
Parents - Grade 8	81.000	387.000	4.4736	18	2.222
Students - Grade 8	162.000	672.000	3.951	41	($p < .05$)
Parents - Grade 10	56.000	234.000	4.000	14	2.111
Teachers - All Secondary	78.000	364.000	4.588	17	($p < .05$)

Table 8

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 6 - Use an encyclopedia

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\bar{X}$	N	t
Parents - Grade 10	63.000	289.000	4.500	14	2.544
Students - Grade 10	157.000	633.000	3.829	41	($p<.05$)
Parents - Grade 8	82.000	396.000	4.526	18	2.468
Teachers - All Secondary	67.000	273.000	3.941	17	($p<.05$)
Parents - Grade 10	63.000	289.000	4.500	14	2.124
Teachers - All Secondary	67.000	273.000	3.941	17	($p<.05$)

Table 9

Significant Differences Between Means of Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 7 - Apply effective study skills.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\bar{X}$	N	t
Teachers - All Secondary	77.000	355.000	4.529	17	2.168
Students - Grade 10	158.000	668.000	3.853	41	$(p<.05)$
Parents - Grade 10	53.000	213.000	3.785	14	2.529
Teachers - All Secondary	77.000	335.000	4.529	17	$(p<.05)$

Table 10.

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 8 - Use clues to letter sounds to identify unknown words.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\overline{X}$	N	t
Students - Grade 6	90.000	382.000	4.090	22	2.369
Students - Grade 8	147.000	553.000	3.583	41	$(p < .05)$
Students - Grade 6	90.000	382.000	4.090	22	2.316
Students - Grade 10	145.000	549.000	3.536	41	$(p < .05)$

Table 11

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 9 - Recognize unstated but inferred meanings - read "between the lines".

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\bar{X}$	N	t
Teachers - Elementary	21.000	89.000	4.2000	5	2.353
Students - Grade 6	68.000	232.000	3.090	22	($p<.05$)
Teachers - All Secondary	65.000	259.000	3.823	17	3.075
Students - Grade 8	124.000	410.000	3.024	41	($p<.01$)
Teachers - All Secondary	65.000	259.000	3.823	17	2.169
Students - Grade 10	133.000	469.000	3.243	41	($p<.05$)
Teachers - All	86.000	348.000	3.909	22	3.593
Students - All	325.000	1111.000	3.125	104	($p<.001$)
Parents - Grade 6	108.000	428.000	3.724	29	2.230
Students - Grade 6	68.000	232.000	3.090	22	($p<.05$)
Parents - Grade 8	69.000	286.000	3.789	18	2.538
Students - Grade 8	124.000	410.000	3.024	41	($p<.05$)

Table 12

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 10 - Tell in one's own words the main ideas of what has been read.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\overline{X}$	N	t
Teachers - Secondary English	19.000	91.000	4.750	4	2.459
Students - Grade	149.000	573.000	3.634	41	$(p<.05)$
Teachers - Secondary English	19.000	91.000	4.750	4	2.681
Students - Grade 10	150.000	574.000	3.658	41	$(p<.05)$
Teachers - All Secondary	78.000	364.000	4.588	17	4.034
Students - Grade 8	149.000	573.000	3.634	41	$(p<.001)$
Teachers - All Secondary	78.000	364.000	4.588	17	4.308
Students - Grade 10	150.000	574.000	3.658	41	$(p<.001)$
Teachers - All	101.000	471.000	4.590	22	4.844
Students - All	384.000	1488.000	3.692	104	$(p<.001)$
Parents - Grade 10	60.000	264.000	4.285	14	2.555
Students - Grade 10	150.000	574.000	3.658	41	$(p<.05)$
Parents - Grade 8	72.000	315.000	3.947	18	2.1577
Teachers - All Secondary	78.000	364.000	4.588	17	$(p<.05)$

Table 13

Significant Differences Between Means
on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 11 - Change the rate of reading to fit different kinds of reading materials and different purposes.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\bar{X}$	N	t
Students - Grade 6	86.000	368.000	3.909	22	2.018
Students - Grade 10	137.000	495.000	3.414	41	($p < .05$)
Parents - Grade 10	56.000	230.000	4.000	14	2.321
Students - Grade 10	150.000	574.000	3.658	41	($p < .05$)

Table 14

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 12 - Find information from each of the different parts of the newspaper.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\overline{X}$	N	t
Teachers - All Secondary	64.000	252.000	3.764	17	2.649
Students - Grade 8	127.000	425.000	3.097	41	($p<.05$)
Teachers - All Secondary	64.000	252.000	3.764	17	2.773
Students - Grade 10	126.000	418.000	3.073	41	($p<.01$)
Teachers - All	83.000	325.000	3.772	22	2.889
Students - All	329.000	1129.000	3.163	104	($p<.01$)
Parents - Grade 10	52.000	200.000	3.714	14	2.353
Students - Grade 10	126.000	418.000	3.073	41	($p<.05$)

Table 15

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 14 - Recognize at sight the one hundred most commonly used words.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\bar{X}$	N	t
Students - Grade 6	79.000	305.000	3.590	22	3.298
Students - Grade 8	146.000	568.000	2.682	41	(p<.01)
Students - Grade 6	99.000	303.000	3.590	22	3.241
Students - Grade 10	112.000	348.000	2.731	41	(p<.01)
Parents - Grade 8	68.000	289.000	3.736	18	3.326
Students - Grade 8	146.000	568.000	2.682	41	(p<.01)

Table 16

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 15 - Use the card catalogue to find a book in the library.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\bar{X}$	N	t
Students - Grade 8	165.000	689.000	4.024	41	2.111
Students - Grade 10	147.000	573.000	3.585	41	($p<.05$)
Parents - Grade 8	63.000	246.000	3.473	18	2.259
Students - Grade 8	165.000	689.000	4.024	41	($p<.05$)
Parents - Grade 6	111.000	443.000	3.827	29	2.095
Teachers - Elementary	15.000	47.000	3.000	5	($p<.05$)

Table 17

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 16 - Outline the main ideas from what has been read.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\overline{X}$	N	t
Teachers - Elementary	20.000	82.000	4.000	5	2.788
Teachers - Secondary English	12.000	36.000	3.000	4	($p<.05$)
Teachers - Secondary English	12.000	36.000	3.000	4	2.058
Students - Grade 8	148.000	548.000	3.609	41	($p<.05$)
Parents - Grade 6	121.000	519.000	4.172	29	2.441
Students - Grade 6	79.000	303.000	3.590	22	($p<.05$)

Table 18

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 17 - Recognize common symbols and signs such as highway signs and warning labels.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\overline{X}$	N	t
Teachers - Secondary English	31.000	109.000	3.444	9	2.685
Teachers - Secondary Other	56.000	250.000	4.307	13	($p<.05$)
Parents - Grade 6	133.000	623.000	4.586	29	3.578
Teachers - Elementary	17.000	59.000	3.400	5	($p<.01$)

Table 19

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 18 - Read when you have free time because you like to.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\bar{X}$	N	t
Parents - Grade 6	112.000	454.000	3.862	29	2.149
Students - Grade 6	71.000	259.000	3.227	22	$(p < .05)$

Table 20.

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 19 - Interpret maps, charts, graphs.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\overline{X}$	N	t
Teachers - All Secondary	74.000	328.000	4.352	17	2.254
Students - Grade 8	158.000	636.000	3.853	41	($p < .05$)
Teachers - All Secondary	74.000	328.000	4.352	17	2.359
Students - Grade 10	156.000	624.000	3.804	41	($p < .05$)
Students - Grade 6	94.000	414.000	4.272	22	2.113
Students - Grade 10	156.000	624.000	3.804	41	($p < .05$)
Teachers - All	96.000	426.000	4.363	22	2.330
Students - All	408.000	1674.000	3.923	104	($p < .05$)

Table 21.

Significant Differences Between Means on Ratings of Reading Objectives

Objective Number 20 - Separate fact from opinion and bias in what is read.

	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\bar{X}$	N	t
Teachers - All Secondary	70.000	298.000	4.117	17	2.830
Students - Grade 8	142.000	518.000	3.463	41	($p < .05$)
Teachers - All Secondary	70.000	298.000	4.117	17	3.224
Students - Grade 10	137.000	487.000	3.341	41	($p < .01$)
Students - Grade 6	87.000	355.000	3.954	22	2.381
Students - Grade 8	142.000	518.000	3.463	41	($p < .05$)
Students - Grade 6	87.000	355.000	3.954	22	2.858
Students - Grade 10	137.000	487.000	3.341	41	($p < .05$)
Teachers - All	89.000	371.000	4.045	22	2.742
Students - All	366.000	1360.000	3.519	104	($p < .01$)

Table 22.

Rank of Means of Teacher Ratings of Reading Objectives[a]

	Elementary Teachers	Secondary English Teachers	Secondary Teachers (Other)	Secondary Teachers (All)	All Teachers
Objective	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank
1	16.5	4.0	18.5	16.5	18.0
2	3.5	8.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
3	3.5	8.0	7.5	6.0	6.0
4	14.0	8.0	13.5	10.5	12.5
5	1.0	2.5	1.0	1.5	1.0
6	8.5	13.5	10.0	9.0	9.0
7	6.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0
8	3.5	8.0	13.5	10.5	7.5
9	8.5	8.0	16.5	13.5	11.0
10	3.5	1.0	2.5	1.5	2.0
11	16.5	13.5	13.5	13.5	15.5
12	14.0	18.0	11.0	16.5	15.5
13	11.0	16.5	16.5	18.5	15.5
14	18.5	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
15	20.0	13.5	13.5	13.5	19.0
16	11.0	19.0	9.0	13.5	12.5
17	18.5	16.5	6.0	7.5	10.0
18	11.0	8.0	18.5	18.5	15.5
19	6.5	8.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
20	14.0	13.5	7.5	7.5	7.5

[a] Rank of 1 = highest mean, 20 = lowest mean.

Table 23.

Rank of Means of Student Ratings of Reading Objectives[a]

	Students Grade 6	Students Grade 8	Students Grade 10	Students All
Objective	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank
1	1.5	1.0	3.0	1.0
2	9.5	14.5	6.5	9.0
3	6.0	2.5	2.0	2.0
4	17.5	16.0	14.5	17.0
5	8.0	7.0	4.0	6.0
6	4.0	4.0	6.5	5.0
7	4.0	2.5	5.0	4.0
8	7.0	13.0	13.0	11.0
9	20.0	19.0	18.0	19.0
10	12.0	10.5	9.5	10.0
11	11.0	9.0	16.5	12.0
12	17.5	18.0	19.0	18.0
13	15.0	14.5	9.5	13.0
14	15.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
15	13.0	5.0	11.5	8.0
16	15.0	12.0	14.5	14.0
17	4.0	6.0	1.0	3.0
18	19.0	10.5	11.5	15.0
19	1.5	8.0	8.0	7.0
20	9.5	17.0	16.5	16.0

[a] Rank of 1 = highest mean, 20 = lowest.

Table 24

Rank of Means of Parent Ratings of Reading Objectives[a]

	Parents - Grade 6	Parents - Grade 8	Parents - Grade 10
Objective	Rank	Rank	Rank
1	3.0	5.0	6.0
2	16.5	14.0	14.5
3	2.0	3.0	2.0
4	10.5	8.0	5.0
5	4.0	2.0	8.0
6	5.0	1.0	2.0
7	6.5	11.5	14.5
8	13.0	9.5	17.5
9	18.0	11.5	14.5
10	6.5	6.5	4.0
11	20.0	19.0	8.0
12	19.0	20.0	17.5
13	10.5	16.0	10.5
14	10.5	14.0	19.0
15	16.5	18.0	8.0
16	8.0	6.5	14.5
17	1.0	4.0	2.0
18	14.5	17.0	20.0
19	14.5	9.5	10.5
20	10.5	14.0	12.0

[a] Rank of 1= highest mean, 20=lowest

Table 25.

Congruency Between Rankings of Reading Objectives

Groups	d^2	rho
Teachers, Elementary/Teachers, Secondary English	482.00	.6376
Teachers, Elementary and Secondary English/ Teachers, Secondary Other	603.50	.5462
Teachers, Elementary/Teachers, Secondary All	459.50	.6545
Teachers, Elementary/Students, Grade 6	1027.00	.2278
Teachers, Secondary All/ Students, Grade 8	831.50	.3748
Teachers, Secondary All/ Students, Grade 10	613.00	.5391
Students, Grade 6/Students Grade 8	358.50	.7304
Students, Grade 6/Students, Grade 10	352.50	.7349
Students, Grade 8/Students, Grade 10	251.00	.8112
Teachers, All/Students, All	806.00	.3939

Table 26.

Highest and Lowest Means of Teacher Ratings of Reading Objectives

Teachers, Elementary

Rank	Objective		Rank	Objective	
1	5	Use reading to learn	20	15	Card Catalogue
2	2	Context clues	19	17	Common signs
3	3	Dictionary	18	14	Sight words
4	8	Phonics	17	11	Change rate
5	10	Tell main ideas	16	1	Oral reading

Teachers, Secondary

Rank	Objective		Rank	Objective	
1	5	Use reading to learn	20	14	Sight words
2	10	Tell main ideas	19	18	Choose to read
3	7	Study skills	18	13	Syllabication
4	19	Maps, graphs	17	12	Newspaper
5	2	Context clues	16	1	Oral reading

Teachers, All

Rank	Objective		Rank	Objective	
1	5	Use reading to learn	20	14	Sight words
2	10	Tell main ideas	19	15	Card catalogue
3	7	Study skills	18	1	Oral reading
4	2	Context clues	17	13 12	Syllabication Newspaper
5	19	Maps, graphs	16	16 18	Outline main ideas Choose to read

Table 27

Highest and Lowest Means of Student Ratings of Reading Objectives

Students, Grade 6

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	1 Oral reading	20	9 Inferences
	19 Common signs	19	18 Choose to read
3	19 Maps, graphs	18	4 Variety in reading
4	6 Encyclopedia		12 Newspaper
	7 Study skills	16	13 Syllabication
			16 Outline main ideas
			14 Sight words

Students, Grade 8

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	1 Oral reading	20	14 Sight words
2	3 Dictionary	19	9 Inferences
3	7 Study skills	18	12 Newspaper
4	6 Encyclopedia	17	20 Fact/bias
5	15 Card catalogue	16	4 Variety in reading

Students, Grade 10

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	17 Common signs	20	14 Sight words
2	3 Dictionary	19	12 Newspaper
3	1 Oral reading	18	9 Inferences
4	5 Use reading to learn	17	20 Fact/bias
5	7 Study skills		11 Change rate

Students, All

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	1 Oral reading	20	14 Sight words
2	3 Dictionary	19	9 Inferences
3	17 Common signs	18	12 Newspaper
4	7 Study skills	17	4 Variety in reading
5	6 Encyclopedia	16	20 Fact/bias

Table 28

Highest and Lowest Means of Parent Ratings of Reading Objectives

Parents, Grade 6

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	17 Common signs	20	11 Change rate
2	3 Dictionary	19	12 Newspaper
3	1 Oral Reading	18	9 Inferences
4	5 Use reading to learn	17	2 Context clues
5	6 Encyclopedia		15 Card catalogue

Parents, Grade 8

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	6 Encyclopedia	20	12 Newspaper
2	5 Use reading to learn	19	11 Change rate
3	3 Dictionary	18	15 Card Catalogue
4	17 Common signs	17	18 Choose to read
5	1 Oral Reading	16	13 Syllabication

Parents, Grade 10

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	3 Dictionary	20	18 Choose to read
	6 Encyclopedia	19	14 Sight words
	17 Common signs	18	8 Phonics
4	10 Tell main ideas		12 Newspaper
5	4 Variety in reading	16	2 Context clues
			7 Study skills
			9 Inferences
			16 Outline main ideas

Table 29.

Student Assessments of Student Competencies on Reading Objectives[a]

	Students Grade 6			Students Grade 8			Students Grade 10			Students All Secondary (8 & 10)		
Objective	y	N	%	y	N	%	y	N	%	y	N	%
1	19	3	86.36	36	5	87.80	30	11	73.17	66	16	80.48
2	20	2	90.90	35	6	85.36	35	6	85.36	70	12	85.36
3	22	0	100.00	40	1	97.56	39	2	95.12	79	3	96.34
4	21	1	95.45	32	9	78.04	39	2	95.12	71	11	86.58
5	22	0	100.00	38	3	92.68	39	2	95.12	77	5	93.90
6	21	1	95.45	40	1	97.56	37	4	90.24	77	5	93.90
7	21	1	95.45	34	7	82.92	30	11	73.17	64	18	78.04
8	20	2	90.90	35	6	85.36	30	11	73.17	65	17	99.26
9	18	4	81.81	30	11	73.17	25	16	60.97	55	27	67.07
10	21	1	95.45	35	6	85.36	34	7	82.92	69	13	84.14
11	17	5	77.27	33	8	80.48	31	10	75.60	64	18	78.04
12	20	2	90.90	36	5	87.80	36	5	87.80	72	10	87.80
13	22	0	100.00	39	2	95.12	37	4	90.24	76	6	92.68
14	17	5	77.27	20	21	48.78	20	21	48.78	40	42	48.78
15	20	2	90.90	35	6	85.36	30	11	73.17	65	17	79.26
16	19	3	86.36	32	9	78.04	35	6	85.36	67	15	81.70
17	20	2	90.90	37	4	90.24	33	8	80.48	70	12	85.36
18	19	3	86.36	34	7	82.92	27	14	65.85	61	21	74.39
19	17	5	77.27	32	9	78.04	34	7	82.92	66	16	80.48
20	19	3	86.36	29	12	70.73	28	13	68.29	57	25	69.51

---

[a] Represented by percentage of students who replied "yes" to the question, Can you do this? following each objective.

Table 30.

Teacher Assessments of Student Competencies on Reading Objectives[a]

Objective	Teachers Elementary All	Teachers Elementary w/o Rem.Rdg.,Sp.Ed.	Teachers Secondary English	Teachers Secondary All
1	52.00	62.50	62.50	50.00
2	48.00	52.50	60.00	47.64
3	72.00	77.50	90.00	72.35
4	56.00	65.00	72.50	57.64
5	68.00	82.50	75.00	60.58
6	52.00	62.50	72.50	58.82
7	42.00	58.00	62.50	45.88
8	64.00	65.00	60.00	57.17
9	54.00	60.00	62.50	51.76
10	64.00	70.00	72.50	58.82
11	44.00	52.50	72.50	51.17
12	48.00	57.50	67.50	57.64
13	66.00	70.00	72.50	54.70
14	62.00	60.00	52.50	49.41
15	30.00	37.50	67.50	49.41
16	54.00	65.00	60.00	49.41
17	66.00	80.00	75.00	60.58
18	62.00	55.00	62.50	50.00
19	58.00	70.00	67.50	60.00
20	44.00	52.50	60.00	48.82

---

[a] Represented by percentage indicated in response to question "What percent of your students can do this?" following each objective.

Table 31

Parent Assessments of Student Competencies on Reading Objectives[a]

	Grade 6			Grade 8			Grade 10			All Secondary (8 & 10)		
Objective	Y	N	%	Y	N	%	Y	N	%	Y	N	%
1	25	3	89	17	1	94	13	1	93	30	2	94
2	25	4	86	18	0	100	14	0	100	32	0	100
3	29	0	100	18	0	100	14	0	100	32	0	100
4	25	4	86	14	4	78	13	1	93	27	5	84
5	26	2	93	18	0	100	14	0	100	32	0	100
6	26	3	90	18	0	100	14	0	100	32	0	100
7	22	7	76	18	0	100	13	1	93	31	1	97
8	27	2	93	15	3	83	14	0	100	29	3	91
9	20	9	69	14	3	82	14	0	100	28	3	90
10	27	2	93	18	0	100	14	0	100	32	0	100
11	24	5	83	16	2	89	13	1	93	29	3	91
12	26	3	90	17	1	94	14	0	100	31	1	97
13	27	2	93	18	0	100	14	0	100	32	0	100
14	25	4	86	17	1	94	12	2	86	29	3	91
15	25	4	86	14	4	78	14	0	100	28	4	90
16	25	3	89	17	1	94	13	1	93	30	2	94
17	28	1	97	17	1	94	14	0	100	31	1	97
18	22	7	76	11	7	61	13	1	93	24	8	75
19	20	8	71	16	2	89	13	1	93	29	3	91
20	23	6	79	12	6	67	13	1	93	25	7	78

---

[a] Represented by percentages of parents who replied "yes" to the question, I think my child can do this? following each objective.

Table 32.

Highest and Lowest Assessments of Student Competencies by Teachers

Teachers, Elementary All

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	3 Dictionary	20	15 Card Catalogue
2	5 Use reading to learn	19	7 Study skills
3	13 Syllabication	18	11 Change rate
4	17 Common signs	17	20 Fact/bias
	8 Phonics		2 Context clues
5	10 Tell main ideas	16	12 Newspaper

Teachers, Elementary w/o Rem. Rdg. & Sp. Ed.

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	5 Use reading to learn	20	15 Card Catalogue
2	17 Common signs	19	2 Context clues
3	3 Dictionary	18	11 Change rate
4	10 Tell main ideas	17	20 Fact/bias
	13 Syllabication		
5	19 Maps, graphs	16	18 Choose reading

Teachers, Secondary English

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	3 Dictionary	20	14 Sight words
2	5 Use reading to learn	19	2 Context clues
3	17 Common signs	18	8 Phonics
4	4 Variety of reading	17	16 Choose reading
	6 Encyclopedia		
5	10 Tell main ideas	16	20 Fact/bias
	11 Change rate		

Teachers, Secondary All

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	3 Dictionary	20	7 Study skills
2	5 Use reading to learn	19	2 Context clues
3	17 Common signs	18	20 Fact/bias
4	19 Maps, graphs	17	14 Sight words
	6 Encyclopedia		15 Card Catalogue
5	10 Tell main ideas	16	16 Outline main ideas

Table 33

Highest and Lowest Assessments of Student Competencies by Students

Students, Grade 6

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	3 Dictionary	20	11 Change rate
2	5 Use reading to learn		14 Sight words
3	13 Syllabication		19 Maps, graphs
4	4 Variety of reading	17	9 Inferences
			1 Oral reading
5	6 Encyclopedia	16	16 Outline main ideas
	7 Study skills		18 Choose reading
	10 Tell main ideas		20 Fact/bias

Students, Grade 8

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	3 Dictionary	20	14 Sight words
	6 Encyclopedia	19	20 Fact/bias
3	13 Syllabication	18	9 Inferences
4	5 Use reading to learn	17	4 Variety of reading
			16 Choose reading
5	17 Common signs		19 Maps, graphs

Students, Grade 10

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	3 Dictionary	20	14 Sight words
	4 Variety of reading	19	9 Inferences
	5 Use reading to learn	18	18 Choose reading
4	6 Encyclopedia	17	20 Fact/bias
			1 Oral reading
	13 Syllabication	16	7 Study skills
			8 Phonics
			15 Card catalogue

Students, All Secondary

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	3 Dictionary	20	14 Sight words
2	5 Use reading to learn	19	9 Inferences
	6 Encyclopeida	18	20 Fact/bias
4	13 Syllabication	17	18 Choose reading
			7 Study skills
5	4 Variety of reading	16	11 Change rate

Table 34

Highest and Lowest Assessments of Student Competencies by Parents

Parents, Grade 6

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	3 Dictionary	17	20 Fact/bias
2	17 Common signs	18	7 Study skills 18 Choose reading
3	5 Use reading to learn 8 Phonics 10 Tell main ideas 13 Syllabication	19	19 Maps, graphs
		20	9 Inferences

Parents, Grade 8

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	2 Context clues 3 Dictionary 5 Use reading to learn 6 Encyclopedia 7 Study skills 10 Tell main ideas 13 Syllabication	17	9 Inferences
		18	4 Variety of reading 15 Card catalogue
		19	20 Fact/bias
		20	18 Choose reading

Parents, Grade 10

Rank	Objective	Rank	Objective
1	2 Context clues 3 Dictionary 5 Use reading to learn 6 Encyclopedia 8 Phonics 9 Inferences 10 Tell main ideas 12 Newspaper 13 Syllabication 15 Card catalogue 17 Fact/bias	20	14 Sight words

Table 35.

Teacher Implementation of Reading Objectives[a]

Objective	Teachers Elementary			Teachers Secondary English			Teachers Secondary Other			Teachers Secondary All			Teachers All		
	y	N	%	y	N	%	y	N	%	y	N	%	y	N	%
1	4	1	80	4	0	100	6	7	46.15	10	7	58.82	14	8	63.63
2	5	0	100	4	0	100	7	6	53.84	11	6	64.70	16	6	72.72
3	5	0	100	4	0	100	9	4	69.23	13	4	76.47	18	4	81.81
4	4	1	80	4	0	100	8	5	61.53	12	5	70.58	16	6	72.72
5	5	0	100	4	0	100	11	2	84.61	15	2	88.23	20	2	90.90
6	4	1	80	3	1	75	8	5	61.53	11	6	64.70	15	7	68.18
7	3	2	60	3	1	75	11	2	84.61	14	3	82.35	17	5	77.27
8	5	0	100	3	1	75	5	8	38.46	8	9	47.05	13	9	59.09
9	5	0	100	4	0	100	6	7	46.15	10	7	58.82	15	7	68.18
10	5	0	100	4	0	100	13	0	100.00	17	0	100.00	22	0	100.00
11	4	1	80	4	0	100	7	6	53.84	11	6	64.70	15	7	68.18
12	2	3	40	2	2	50	7	6	53.84	9	8	52.94	11	11	50.00
13	4	1	80	4	0	100	7	6	53.84	11	6	64.70	15	7	68.18
14	2	3	40	1	3	25	3	10	23.07	4	13	23.52	6	16	27.27
15	0	5	0	2	2	100	4	9	30.76	6	11	35.29	6	16	27.27
16	5	0	100	4	0	100	7	6	53.84	11	6	64.70	16	6	27.27
17	2	3	40	0	4	0	7	6	53.84	7	10	41.17	9	13	40.70
18	4	1	80	3	1	75	6	7	46.15	9	8	52.74	13	9	59.09
19	4	1	80	3	1	75	12	1	92.30	15	2	88.23	19	3	86.36
20	4	1	80	4	0	100	10	3	76.92	14	3	82.35	18	4	81.81

---

[a] As indicated by response to question "Do you teach this? following each objective.

Table 36.

Rank of Items - Concept of Reading Inventory - Students Grade 2 (N=39)*

Rank	f	% Checked		Item: A good reader
1.5	30	76.92	19-3	Will not have to ask the teacher any of the words in the story.
	30		20-3	Knows all the words and does not have to stop.
3.0	28	71.79	3-3	Should read nicely so it sounds good to others.
4.5	25	64.11	9-2	Always says the words clearly.
	25		16-2	Reads so well that he almost never misses a word.
7.5	23	58.97	1-1	Knows all the words and can read like the teacher.
	23		5-3	Knows how to stand up straight and hold his book.
	23		14-3	Knows how to sound out all the words.
	23		18-1	Is one who can read as well as the teacher.
10.5	21	53.85	4-3	Will almost never ask the teacher to tell him any words.
	21		12-2	Reads fast and never stumbles when he reads.
12.5	20	51.28	2-2	Reads so that others will think he is smart.
	20		13-2	Reads so that it sounds good to others.
15.0	19	48.72	7-2	Can sound out all the words when he reads.
	19		10-1	Does not have to ask the teacher any of the words in the story.
	19		17-3	Knows which books are best for him to read.
17.0	18	46.15	11-3	Knows that reading with expression is the most important part of reading.
18.0	17	43.59	6-2	Is one who always does a good job of reading.
19.5	16	41.03	8-1	Will know which books are best for him.
	16		15-1	Stands up straight and knows how to hold his book.
22.0	15	38.46	2-3	Reads so well it sounds like he is talking.
	15		7-3	Does not stumble over the words when he reads.
	15		*18-3	Is one who remembers what he has read.

* Indicates responses considered "correct" for arriving at a total score.

Table 36. (Continued)

Rank	f	%Checked		Item: A good reader
25.5	14	35.90	4-2	Will always say each word clearly so others can understand him.
	14		11-1	Is one who always does a good job of reading.
27.5	13	33.33	12-3	Reads to make others think he is smart.
	13		14-2	Does not read too loudly but says each word clearly.
31.0	12	30.77	5-2	Knows that reading with expression is the most important part of reading.
	12		*6-1	Is one who reads and remembers what he has read.
	12		*8-3	Will usually choose books which are easy.
	12		*13-1	Usually enjoys what he reads.
	12		15-2	Is one who has read many books.
35.0	11	28.21	8-2	Will take lots of books out of the library.
	11		*15-3	Chooses books which interest him and which are easy for him to read.
	11		*17-1	Can always tell what the story is about.
38.0	10	25.64	6-3	Is a good reader because he has read many books.
	10		*10-2	Knows what the story is all about.
	10		10-3	Tries to sound like the teacher when he reads.
41.0	9	23.08	1-3	Knows all of the words and does not have to stop.
	9		*3-2	Should enjoy what he is reading.
	9		17-2	Can read without moving his eyes or head.
45.5	7	17.95	*1-2	Knows that sometimes you read fast and sometimes you slow down.
	7		9-1	Stands straight and holds his book down by his chest.
	7		*9-3	Feels that he is right in the story.
	7		*11-2	Sometimes reads and rereads a sentence until he knows what it means.
	7		19-2	Will say the words clearly when he reads.
	7		20-2	Goes to the library and gets many books to take out.

* Indicates responses considered "correct" for arriving at a total score.

Table 36. (Continued)

Rank	f	% Checked		Item: A good reader
49.5	6	15.38	13-3	Tries to sound like the teacher when he reads.
	6		*16-1	Reads just the words in the book.
51.5	5	12.82	*7-1	Does not put in other words when he reads.
	5		*12-1	Compares the things he reads with the things that have happened to him.
54.0	4	10.26	*2-1	Reads to get the exact meaning of the words in the story.
	4		*4-1	Will sometimes read and reread a sentence until he understands it.
	4		*5-1	Knows how to compare what he is reading about to his own life.
56.5	3	7.69	*14-1	Sometimes reads fast and sometimes reads slowly.
	3		*20-1	Can feel that he is right in the story that he is reading.
58.5	2	5.13	3-1	Should be able to read without moving his eyes or head.
	2		*19-1	Reads to get the exact meaning of each word in the story.
60.0	1	2.56	18-2	Is one who stands or sits up straight and knows how to hold his books.

* Indicates responses considered "correct" for arriving at a total score.

Table 37.

Rank of Items - *Concept of Reading Inventory*
Students Grade 4 (N=37)*

Rank	f	% Checked		Item: A good reader
1.0	25	67.57	3-3	Should read nicely so it sounds good to others.
2.0	24	64.86	14-3	Knows how to sound out all of the words.
3.0	23	62.16	9-2	Always ways the words clearly.
4.5	22	59.46	1-3	Knows all of the words and does not have to stop.
	22	59.46	*18-3	Is one who remembers what he has read.
6.5	21	56.76	15-2	Is one who has read many books.
	21	56.76	20-3	Knows all of the words and does not have to stop.
8.0	19	51.35	5-2	Knows that reading with expression is the most important part of reading.
9.5	18	48.65	4-3	Will almost never ask the teacher to tell him any words.
	18	48.65	12-2	Reads fast and never stumbles when he reads.
11.5	16	43.24	7-2	Can sound out all of the words when he reads.
	16	43.24	17-3	Knows which books are best for him to read.
15.5	15	40.54	*2-1	Reads to get the exact meaning of the words in the story.
	15	40.54	6-2	Is one who always does a good job of reading.
	15	40.54	8-1	Will know which books are best for him.
	15	40.54	8-2	Will take lots of books out of the library.
	15	40.54	*13-1	Usually enjoys what he reads.
	15	40.54	19-3	Will not have to ask the teacher any of the words in the story.
21.0	14	37.84	4-2	Will always say each word clearly so that others can understand him.
	14	37.84	10-1	Does not have to ask the teacher any of the words in the story.
	14	37.84	11-1	Is one who always does a good job of reading.
	14	37.84	16-2	Reads so well he almost never misses a word.
	14	37.84	19-2	Will say the words clearly when he reads.

* Indicates responses considered "correct" for arriving at a total score.

Table 37. (Continued)

Rank	f	% Checked		Item: A good reader
26.0	13	35.14	7-3	Does not stumble over the words when he reads.
	13	35.14	10-3	Tries to sound like the teacher when he reads.
	13	35.14	*11-2	Sometimes reads and rereads a sentence until he knows what it means.
	13	35.14	16-3	Reads so well it sounds as if he were talking.
	13	35.14	*17-1	Can always tell what the story is about.
31.5	12	32.43	1-1	Knows all the words and can read like the teacher.
	12	32.43	2-3	Reads so well that it sounds like he is talking.
	12	32.43	*6-1	Is one who reads and then remembers what he has read.
	12	32.43	13-2	Reads so that it sound good to others.
	12	32.43	14-2	Does not read too loudly but says each word clearly.
	12	32.43	*15-3	Chooses books which interest him and which are easy for him to read.
35.5	11	29.73	5-3	Knows how to stand up straight and hold his book.
	11	29.73	*12-1	Compares the things he reads with the things that have happened to him.
39.5	10	27.03	2-2	Reads so that others will think that he is smart.
	10	27.03	6-3	Is a good reader because he has read many books.
	10	27.03	*10-2	Knows what the story is all about.
	10	27.03	11-3	Knows that reading with expression in the most important part of reading.
	10	27.03	13-3	Tries to sound like the teacher when he reads.
	10	27.03	*16-1	Reads just the words in the book.
43.0	9	24.32	*3-2	Should enjoy what he is reading.
46.5	8	21.62	*7-1	Does not put in other words when he reads.
	8	21.62	17-2	Can read without moving his head or eyes.
	8	21.62	18-1	Is one who can read as well as the teacher.
	8	21.62	*19-1	Reads to get the exact meaning of each word in the story.
	8	21.62	*20-1	Can feel he is right in the story that he is reading.
	8	21.62	20-2	Goes to the library and gets many books to take out.

* Indicates responses considered "correct" for arriving at a total score.

Table 37. (Continued)

Rank	f	% Checked		Item: A good reader
52.5	7	18.92	*5-1	Knows how to compare what he is reading about to his own life.
	7	18.92	*8-3	Will usually choose books which are easy for him.
	7	18.92	9-1	Stands straight and holds his book down by his chest.
	7	18.92	*9-3	Feels that he is right in the story.
	7	18.92	12-3	Reads to make others think he is smart.
	7	18.92	18-2	Is one who stands or sits up straight and knows how to hold his book.
56.0	5	13.51	*4-1	Will sometimes read and reread a sentence until he understands it.
57.0	4	10.81	15-1	Stands up straight and knows how to hold his book.
58.5	3	8.11	*1-2	Knows that sometimes you read fast and sometimes you slow down.
	3	8.11	3-1	Should be able to read without moving his eyes or head.
60.0	1	2.70	*14-1	Sometimes reads fast and sometimes reads slowly.

* Indicates responses considered "correct" for arriving at a total score.

Table 38.

Rank of Items - Concept of Reading Inventory
Teachers K-4 (N=20)*

Rank	f	% Checked		Item: A good reader
1.5	20	100	*12-1	Compares the things he reads with the things that have happened to him.
	20	100	*18-3	Is one who remembers what he has read.
3.5	19	95	*5-1	Knows how to compare what he is reading about to his own life.
	19	95	*6-1	Is one who reads and then remembers what he has read.
6.0	18	90	*10-2	Knows what the story is all about.
	18	90	*17-1	Can always tell what the story is about.
	18	90	*20-1	Can feel that he is right in the story that he is reading.
9.0	17	85	*3-2	Should enjoy what he is reading.
	17	85	*9-3	Feels that he is right in the story.
	17	85	*13-1	Usually enjoys what he reads.
11.5	16	80	*2-1	Reads to get the exact meaning of the words in the story.
	16	80	*4-1	Will sometimes read and reread a sentence until he understands it.
13.5	15	75	16-3	Reads so well that it sounds as if he were talking.
	15	75	*19-1	Reads to get the exact meaning of each word in the story.
15.0	14	70	*11-2	Sometimes reads and rereads a sentence until he knows what it means.
16.0	13	65	*15-3	Chooses books which interest him and which are easy for him to read.
17.0	12	60	7-2	Can sound out all the words when he reads.
19.0	10	50	*1-2	Knows that sometimes you read fast, and sometimes you slow down.
	10	50	8-2	Will take lots of books out of the library.
	10	50	14-3	Knows how to sound out all the words.
21.0	9	45	1-3	Knows all the words and does not have to stop.
22.0	8	40	7-3	Does not stumble over the words when he reads.
23.0	6	30	14-2	Does not read too loudly but says each word clearly.

* Indicates responses considered "correct" for arriving at total score.

Table 38. (Continued)

Rank	f	% Checked		Item: A good reader
25.0	5	25	8-1	Will know which books are best for him.
	5	25	*8-3	Will usually choose books which are easy for him.
	5	25	15-2	Is one who has read many books.
27.5	4	20	*14-1	Sometimes reads fast and sometimes reads slowly.
	4	20	16-2	Reads so well he almost never misses a word.
30.5	3	15	2-3	Reads so well that it sounds like he is talking.
	3	15	4-3	Will almost never ask the teacher to tell him any words.
	3	15	9-2	Always says the words clearly.
	3	15	11-3	Knows that reading with expression is the most important part of reading.
36.0	2	10	3-3	Should read nicely so it sounds good to others.
	2	10	10-1	Does not have ask the teacher any of the words in the story.
	2	10	11-1	Is one who always does a good job of reading.
	2	10	13-2	Reads so that it sounds good to others.
	2	10	15-1	Stands up straight and knows how to hold his book.
	2	10	19-2	Will say the words clearly when he reads.
	2	10	19-3	Will not have to ask the teacher any of the words in the story.
45.0	1	5	1-1	Knows all the words and can read like the teacher.
	1	5	2-2	Reads so others will think he is smart.
	1	5	3-1	Should be able to read without moving his eyes or head.
	1	5	4-2	Will always say each word clearly so that others can understand him.
	1	5	5-2	Knows that reading with expression is the most important part of reading.
	1	5	6-2	Is one who always does a good job of reading.
	1	5	*16-1	Reads just the words in the book.
	1	5	17-2	Can read without moving his head or eyes.
	1	5	17-3	Knows which books are best for him.

* Indicates responses considered "correct" for arriving at total scores.

Table 38. (Continued)

Rank	f	% Checked		Item: A good reader
45.0	1	5	20-2	Goes to the library and gets many books to take out.
	1	5	20-3	Knows all the words and does not have to stop.
55.0	0	0	5-3	Knows how to stand up straight and hold his book.
	0	0	6-3	Is a good reader because he has read many books.
	0	0	*7-1	Does not put in other words when he reads.
	0	0	9-1	Stands up straight and holds his book down by his chest.
	0	0	10-3	Tries to sound like the teacher when he reads.
	0	0	12-2	Reads fast and never stumbles when he reads.
	0	0	12-3	Reads to make others think he is smart.
	0	0	13-3	Tries to sound like the teacher when he reads.
	0	0	18-1	Is one who can read as well as the teacher.
	0	0	18-2	Is one who stands or sits up straight and knows how to hold his book.

* Indicates responses considered "correct" for arriving at total scores.

Table 39

Rank of Items - Concept of reading inventory
Parents - Grades 2 and 4 (N=60)

Rank	F	% checked	Item: A good reader
1	53	88.33	*6-1 Is one who reads and them remembers what he has read
2	52	86.67	*18-3 Is one who remembers what he has read
3	50	83.33	*2-1 Reads to get the exact meaning of the words in the story
4	46	76.67	*10-2 Knows what the story is all about
5	45	75.00	*13-1 Usually enjoys what he is reading
6	42	70.00	* 3-2 Should enjoy what he is reading
7	40	66.67	16-3 Reads so well it sounds as if he were talking
8.5	37	6.67	5-2 Knows that reading with expression is the most important part of reading
	37	61.67	9-2 Always says the words clearly
10.5	36	60.00	*17-1 Can always tell what the story is about
	36	60.00	*20-1 Can feel that he is right in the story that he is reading
12.5	35	58.33	8-1 Will know which books are best for him
	35	58.33	*19-1 Reads to get the exact meaning of each word in the story
14	32	53.33	12-2 Reads fast and never stumbles when he reads
15	31	51.67	*4-1 Will sometimes read and reread a sentence until he understands it
16.5	30	50.00	14-2 Does not read too loudly but says each word clearly
	30	50.00	*15-3 Chooses books which interest him and are easy for him to read
18.5	28	46.67	1-3 Knows all the words and does not have to stop
			*11-2 Sometimes reads and rereads a sentence until he knows what it means
20.5	26	43.33	*1-2 Knows that sometimes you read fast and sometimes you slow down

Table 39
(con't)

Rank	F	% checked	Item: A good reader
	26	43.33	4-2 Will always say each word clearly so that others can understand him
22.5	24	40.00	7-3 Does not stumble over the words when he reads
	24	40.00	*12-1 Compares the things he reads with the things that have happened to him
24	22	36.67	17-3 Knows which books are best for him
25	21	35.00	19-2 Will say the words clearly when he reads
27	20	33.33	7-2 Can sound out all the words when he reads
	20	33.33	*9-3 Feels that he is right in the story
	20	33.33	11-3 Knows that reading with expression is the most important part of reading
29	19	31.67	14-3 Knows how to sound out all of the words
30	18	30.00	20-3 Knows all the words and does not have to stop
32.5	15	25.00	*7-1 Does not put in other words when he reads
	15	25.00	8-2 Will take lots of books out of the library
	15	25.00	15-1 Stands up straight and knows how to hold his book
	15	25.00	15-2 Is one who has read many books
35	14	23.33	3-3 Should read nicely so it sounds good to others
37	13	21.67	11-1 Is one who always does a good job of reading
	13	21.67	13-2 Reads so that it sounds good to others
	13	21.67	*14-1 Sometimes reads fast and sometimes reads slowly
39	12	20.00	5-3 Knows how to stand up straight and hold his book
40.5	10	16.67	*5-1 Knows how to compare what he is reading about to his own life
	10	16.67	16-2 Reads so well he almost never misses a word

Table 39
(con't)

Rank	F	% checked	Item: A good reader
43.5	9	15.00	2-3 Reads so well it sounds like he is talking
	9	15.00	*8-3 Will usually choose books which are easy for him
	9	15.00	10-1 Does not have to ask the teacher any of the words in the story
	9	15.00	*16-1 Reads just the words in the book
46	7	11.67	18-2 Is one who stands or sits up straight
48	5	8.33	1-1 Knows all the words and can read
	5	8.33	6-2 Is one who always does a good job of reading
	5	8.33	20-2 Goes to the library and gets many books to take out
50.5	4	6.67	3-1 Should be able to read without moving his eyes or head
	4	6.67	10-3 Tries to sound like the teacher when he reads
53	3	5.00	4-3 Will almost never ask the teacher to tell him any words
	3	5.00	9-1 Stands up straight and holds his book down by his chest
	3	5.00	19-3 Will not have to ask the teacher any of the words in the story
56	2	3.33	6-3 Is a good reader because he has read many books
	2	3.33	12-3 Reads to make others think he is smart
	2	3.33	17-2 Can read without moving his head or eyes
58.5	1	1.67	2-2 Reads so others will think he is smart
	1	1.67	13-3 Tries to sound like the teacher when he reads
60	0	0.00	18-1 Is one who can read as well as the teacher

* Indicates responses considered "correct" for arriving at total score

Table 40

Comparison of Means - Concept of Reading Inventory

	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
Students - Grade 2	39	3.79	1.91	3.13	.01
Students - Grade 4	37	5.43	2.56		
Students - Grade 2	39	3.79	1.91	15.98	.001
Teachers - Grades K-4	20	13.85	2.81		
Students - Grade 4	37	5.43	2.56	11.24	.001
Teachers - Grade K-4	20	13.85	2.81		
Parents - Grade 2	35	10.63	4.11	0.22	
Parents - Grade	25	10.40	3.55		
Students - Grade 2	39	3.79	1.91	9.20	.001
Parents - Grade 2	35	10.63	4.11		
Parents - Grade 2	35	10.63	4.11	3.05	.01
Teachers - Grades K-4	20	13.85	2.81		
Students - Grade 4	37	5.43	2.56	6.29	.001
Parents - Grade 4	25	10.40	3.55		
Parents - Grade 4	25	10.40	3.55	3.46	.01
Teachers - Grades K-4	20	13.85	2.81		

Table 41.

Comparison of Means - School Attitude Scale - One

Scale 1 - Self-concept in Relationships with Peers

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
2	11	3.55	0.82	0.03456	ns
4	32	3.53	1.27		

Scale 2 - Self-concept in Relationships with Family

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
2	11	2.91	0.70	1.30277	ns
4	32	2.38	1.29		

Scale 3 - Self-concept in Relationships with School

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
2	11	2.36	1.21	-1.07647	ns
4	32	2.84	1.30		

Scale 4 - Self-concept in General

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
2	11	2.55	0.52	-0.05469	ns
4	32	2.56	0.98		

Scale 5 - Attitude Toward Peers

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
2	11	2.81	0.75	-0.18655	ns
4	32	2.86	0.91		

Scale 6 - Attitude Toward Teachers

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
2	11	2.73	0.47	0.89359	ns
4	32	2.53	0.67		

Scale 7 - Attitude Toward School in General

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
2	11	3.36	0.92	2.59570	.05
4	32	2.53	0.92		

Scale 8 - Attitude Toward School Social Structure

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
2	11	2.09	0.94	-0.66770	ns
4	32	2.34	1.12		

Table 41. (Continued)

Scale 9 - Attitude Toward Learning Activities

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
2	11	4.27	0.90	[illegible]0100	ns
4	32	3.75	1.22		

Group Mean - Attitude Toward Self

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
2	11	11.36	2.38	0.05041	ns
4	32	11.31	3.05		

Group Mean - Attitude Toward School

Grade	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
[illegible]	11	15.27	2.61	1.45262	ns
4	32	14.03	2.39		

Table 42.

Comparison of Means - School Attitude Scale - Two

Scale 1 - Self-concept in Relationships with Peers

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	5.92	1.75	1.46159	ns
8	38	5.32	1.78		

Scale 2 - Self-concept in Relationships with Family

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	5.42	1.57	2.35765	.05
8	38	4.63	1.28		

Scale 3 - Self-concept in Relationships with School

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	5.94	1.94	0.93555	ns
8	38	5.58	1.39		

Scale 4 - Self-concept in General

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	6.33	1.96	-0.09171	ns
8	38	6.37	1.28		

Scale 5 - Attitude Toward Peers

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	5.92	1.95	2.94414	.01
8	38	4.63	1.81		

Scale 6 - Attitude Toward Teachers

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	5.72	1.63	2.31565	.05
8	38	4.84	1.64		

Scale 7 - Attitude Toward School in General

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	5.44	1.50	2.56953	.05
8	38	4.61	1.31		

Scale 8 - Attitude Toward School Social Structure

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	4.33	1.29	-0.54715	ns
8	38	4.50	1.33		

Table 42. (Continued)

Scale 9 - Attitude Toward Learning Activities

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	5.43	2.03	3.11851	.01
8	38	4.03	1.81		

Group Mean - Attitude Toward Self

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	24.17	3.77	2.60479	.05
8	38	21.89	3.73		

Group Mean - Attitude Toward School

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	P
6	36	27.09	4.86	3.68410	.001
8	38	22.87	4.91		

Table 43.

Means - School Attitude Scale - Three
(Grade 10 N=42)

Scale	$\overline{X}$	SD
1	5.31	1.65
2	5.02	1.30
3	5.67	1.60
4	6.52	1.10
5	3.50	1.05
6	5.74	2.84
7	4.45	1.88
8	5.86	2.01
9	3.95	1.32
Self	22.76	3.62
School	26.36	4.46

Table 44.

Comparison of Group Means - Attitude Toward Self

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	p
2-Urban	121	12.31	3.06	0.99484	ns
2-FG-Th	11	11.36	2.38		
4-Urban	114	12.31	3.56	0.05041	ns
4-FG-Th	32	11.31	3.05		
6-Urban	161	26.56	6.00	2.27935	.05
6-FG-Th	36	24.17	3.77		
8-Urban	243	27.06	6.07	2.60479	.05
8-FG-Th	38	21.89	3.73		
9-12 Urban	155	27.88	6.44		
10 FG-Th	42	22.76	3.62	4.91987	.001

Table 45.

Comparison of Group Means - Attitude Toward School

Grade	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	p
2-Urban	121	14.91	3.77	0.03076	ns
2-FG-Th	11	14.03	2.39		
4-Urban	114	16.00	4.90	2.18681	.05
4-FG-Th	32	14.03	2.39		
6-Urban	161	29.78	7.43	2.03825	.05
6-FG-Th	36	27.09	4.86		
8-Urban	243	28.84	7.74	4.59538	.001
8-FG-Th	38	22.87	4.91		
9-12 Urban	155	27.94	7.64	1.27582	ns
10 FG-Th	42	26.36	4.46		

Table 46.

Primary Locus of Decision Making - Elementary Teachers (N=20), Secondary Teachers (N=26), and Administrators/Supervisors (N=9)

Item	Principal			Department Head			Special Subject Supervisor			Board of Education			Teacher			Other		
	E	S	A/S	E	S	A/S	E	S	A/S	E	S	A/S	E	S	A/S	E	S	A/S
1	0	0	1	1	1	1	10	18	0	3	5	1	6	2	4	1	0	1
2	2	5	5	0	0	0	7	5	2	3	5	0	5	1	2	0	9	0
3	15	22	8	1	1	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
4	5	8	3	1	3	1	5	5	3	0	11	1	5	3	0	1	1	1
5	1	3	0	3	4	2	9	12	3	7	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
6	4	2	2	0	1	1	2	8	1	4	7	0	4	1	3	0	2	0
7	0	5	2	0	0	1	7	1	2	8	13	0	5	4	3	0	2	1
8	2	4	3	0	1	1	8	13	2	8	6	0	2	1	2	1	2	0
9	0	2	2	1	0	1	6	2	0	9	10	2	4	10	4	0	2	1
10	1	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	16	13	8	0	2	0
11	4	7	5	0	3	2	12	12	3	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
12	0	4	1	0	1	1	9	5	0	7	15	2	3	0	1	4	0	4
13	10	17	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	6	3	2	0	1	0
14	0	0	1	1	5	3	11	10	0	2	6	0	0	4	3	1	0	3
15	2	3	1	1	0	1	13	14	2	4	7	4	0	3	0	0	0	1
16	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	12	5	5	5	0	1	2	0	0	3	1
17	1	0	1	2	2	1	13	18	3	3	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	1
18	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	16	23	4	0	0	2
19	5	17	6	1	0	0	2	1	0	12	6	3	0	1	0	0	0	0
20	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	0	16	22	5	0	0	0	0	0	2

Table 47.

Percentage of Total Responses Assigned to Each Role As the Primary Locus of Decision Making

Item	Principal			Department Head			Special Subjects Supervisor			Board of Education			Teacher			Other		
	El	Sec	A/S	El	Sec	A/S	El	Sec	A/S	El	Sec	A/S	El	Sec	A/S	El	Sec	A/S
1	0	0	.11	.05	.04	.11	.50	.69	0	.15	.19	.11	.30	.08	.44	.05	0	.11
2	.10	.19	.56	0	0	0	.35	.19	.22	.35	.19	0	.25	.04	.22	0	.35	0
3	.75	.85	.89	.05	.04	0	.05	.04	.11	.15	.04	0	.05	.08	0	0	0	0
4	.25	.31	.33	.05	.12	.11	.25	.19	.33	0	.42	.11	.25	.12	0	.05	.04	.11
5	.05	.12	0	.15	.15	.22	.45	.46	.33	.35	.38	.11	0	0	0	0	0	.11
6	.20	.08	.22	0	.05	.11	.10	.31	.11	.20	.27	0	.20	.04	.33	0	.08	0
7	0	.19	.22	0	0	.11	.35	.04	.22	.40	.50	0	.25	.15	.33	0	.08	.11
8	.10	.15	.33	0	.04	.11	.40	.50	.22	.40	.23	0	.10	.04	.22	.05	.08	0
9	0	.08	.22	.05	0	.11	.30	.77	0	.45	.38	.22	.20	.38	.44	0	.08	.11
10	.05	.23	.11	0	.04	0	0	0	0	.15	.15	0	.80	.50	.89	0	.08	0
11	.20	.27	.55	0	.12	.22	.60	.46	.33	.20	.12	0	0	.11	0	0	0	0
12	0	.15	.11	0	.04	.11	.45	.19	0	.35	.57	.22	.15	0	.11	.20	0	.44
13	.50	.65	.67	.05	0	0	0	0	0	.10	.19	.11	.30	.12	.22	0	.04	0
14	0	0	.11	.05	.19	.33	.55	.38	0	.10	.23	0	0	.15	.33	.05	0	.33
15	.10	.11	.11	.05	0	.11	.65	.54	.22	.20	.27	.44	0	.12	0	0	0	.11
16	.05	.04	.11	.05	.04	.11	.60	.46	.56	.25	.19	0	.05	.08	0	0	.12	.11
17	.05	0	.11	.10	.08	.11	.65	.69	.33	.15	.15	.22	.05	0	.11	0	0	.11
18	.10	0	0	.05	0	0	0	.12	.33	0	0	0	.80	.88	.44	0	0	.22
19	.25	.65	.77	.05	0	0	.10	.04	0	.60	.23	.33	0	.04	0	0	0	0
[illegible]	0	.04	.22	.05	0	0	.10	.04	0	.80	.85	.55	0	0	0	0	0	.22

Table 48.

Participants in Decision - Making As Perceived by Teachers and Administrators and Supervisors*

Item #1. The decision on the selection of curriculum problems in reading and language arts for study.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	7	4	42	16	29	2
Secondary Teachers	5	15	40	14	19	7
Administrators/Supervisors	20	15	25	5	30	5

Item #2. The decision on the ways to group pupils by classes.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	31	0	24	14	31	0
Secondary Teachers	22	1	15	11	14	30
Administrators/Supervisors	35	0	15	10	29	18

Item #3. The decision on the priority for the use of rooms and other areas for the purpose of reading - language arts related activities.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	45	5	14	13	23	0
Secondary Teachers	46	10	9	5	19	11
Administrators/Supervisors	41	11	15	3	30	0

Item #4. The decision on the appointment of teachers to reading - language arts curriculum committees.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	34	10	27	18	11	0
Secondary Teachers	31	18	22	20	6	3
Administrators/Supervisors	33	14	30	9	5	9

Item #5. The decision on the reading - language arts instructional aids to be included in the budget.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	14	11	30	34	11	0
Secondary Teachers	5	14	36	31	14	0
Administrators/Supervisors	7	14	32	9	32	6

Table 48. (Continued)

Item #6. The decision on the means for increasing community understanding of curriculum developments in reading and language arts.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	33	1	13	14	39	
Secondary Teachers	21	9	24	17	17	12
Administrators/Supervisors	32	10	24	4	24	6

Item #7. The decision on the content of pupils' cumulative record.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	26	6	27	22	20	2
Secondary Teachers	27	2	9	23	19	20
Administrators/Supervisors	21	8	17	13	29	22

Item #8. The decision on the selection of teachers for participation in experimental instructional programs in reading - language arts.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	28	6	35	24	7	0
Secondary Teachers	30	11	35	16	8	0
Administrators/Supervisors	27	11	29	2	26	5

Item #9. The decision on how to report pupil progress in reading - language arts to parents.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	19	2	24	25	30	0
Secondary Teachers	28	3	13	22	23	11
Administrators/Supervisors	24	5	12	14	34	9

Item #10. The decision on the retention of pupils.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	33	0	10	10	47	0
Secondary Teachers	28	4	5	11	35	17
Administrators/Supervisors	37	0	3	0	50	10

Table 48. (Continued)

Item #11. The decision on the adequacy of teacher performance in the reading - language arts area.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	33	4	47	14	2	0
Secondary Teachers	33	7	36	19	5	0
Administrators/Supervisors	41	13	29	13	0	4

Item #12. The decision on the regulations concerning lesson plans for reading - language arts.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	14	2	43	23	18	0
Secondary Teachers	22	6	28	30	10	4
Administrators/Supervisors	23	9	15	18	14	21

Item #13. The decision on the rules governing pupil conduct.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	43	2	4	14	37	0
Secondary Teachers	40	1	0	6	25	28
Administrators/Supervisors	43	0	0	17	33	7

Item #14. The decision on the selection of textbooks in the reading - language arts.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	5	7	37	17	29	5
Secondary Teachers	8	13	40	13	25	1
Administrators/Supervisors	19	17	17	3	27	17

Item #15. The decision on the procedure for obtaining instructional supplies for reading - language arts.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	21	6	34	18	21	0
Secondary Teachers	15	7	37	19	21	3
Administrators/Supervisors	16	13	25	20	15	5

Table 48. (Continued)

Item #16. The decision on how to evaluate the reading - language arts curriculum.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	21	5	43	15	16	0
Secondary Teachers	9	7	36	15	21	12
Administrators/Supervisors	21	14	30	4	21	10

Item #17. The decision on the activities for in-service development of the staff in reading - language arts.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	20	9	40	16	15	0
Secondary Teachers	5	8	41	34	8	0
Administrators/Supervisors	16	17	30	14	23	1

Item #18. The decision on the practices for assigning homework in reading - language arts.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	26	3	16	3	52	0
Secondary Teachers	3	10	22	5	60	0
Administrators/Supervisors	14	10	30	0	39	6

Item #19. The decision on the assignment of teaching and non-teaching loads.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	33	5	17	40	5	0
Secondary Teachers	46	3	13	26	7	5
Administrators/Supervisors	53	9	0	23	11	4

Item #20. The decision on who will participate in the formulation of the school budget.

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	15	6	17	62	0	0
Secondary Teachers	23	1	8	58	4	6
Administrators/Supervisors	22	10	6	32	13	17

Table 48. (Continued)

Total - All Decision Items

	Prin.	Dept. Hd.	Special Subject Supervisor	Board of Education	Teacher	Other
Elementary Teachers	26.78	4.70	27.20	20.60	22.15	0.45
Secondary Teachers	22.35	7.95	23.45	19.75	18.00	8.95
Administrators/Supervisors	27.45	10.00	19.20	10.15	24.20	8.75

*Total Scores were obtained by assigning the following values:

1=5 points, 2=4 points, 3=3 points, 4=2 points, and 5=1 point. Rankings beyond 5 were not used. Scores were then converted to percentage by dividing by the total number of points for each item.

Table 49

Means and Standard Deviations of Item Scores on Reading Diagnostic Survey - Grades 6,8, and 10.

Objective	Grade	6(N=23)	Grade	8(N=31)	Grade	10(N=23)
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
*2.Context Clues	0.826	1.059	1.096	.750	1.609	1.260
3.Dictionary	1.913	1.488	2.185	1.388	2.273	1.290
*4.Variety of Materials	1.696	1.129	2.096	.776	2.696	.999
5.Finding Information	7.375	3.108	9.000	1.743	8.409	2.384
6.Encyclopedia	3.522	2.219	4.037	3.943	4.136	1.674
7.Study Skills	4.130	1.623	4.111	2.060	3.818	1.514
8.Phonics	5.261	4.355	6.290	5.328	6.913	6.227
9.Inferences	1.083	.957	1.400	1.407	1.591	1.729
10.Main Ideas	0.870	0.558	0.806	2.974	1.391	0.932
11.Reading Speed	1.583	1.255	1.960	1.049	1.227	1.084
*12.Newspaper	3.094	1.493	2.678	0.963	4.174	1.282
13.Syllabication	7.917	3.310	8.840	3.815	7.773	4.379
14.Sight Words	97.957	2.604	98.82	1.089	98.91	1.175
*15.Card catalogue	0.978	1.014	1.290	1.029	1.913	1.028
16.Outlining	3.958	3.604	5.120	5.036	4.909	4.100
17.Common Symbols	2.696	3.028	2.806	0.761	3.652	0.894
18.Reading in Free Time	2.458	1.208	3.120	1.430	3.409	1.854
*19.Maps, Charts, Graphs	1.522	1.019	1.871	1.062	2.391	0.872
20.Separate Fact-Bias	8.792	2.353	9.09	2.633	9.273	2.553

Table 50

Percent of Mastery Represented by Mean Scores on Diagnostic Reading Survey

	Possible Score	N=23 Grade 6 $\overline{X}$	N=31 Grade 8 $\overline{X}$	N=23 Grade 10 $\overline{X}$	Grade 6 % of Mastery	Grade 8 % of Mastery	Grade 10 % of Mastery
2.Context Clues	3	0.826	1.096	1.690	27.53	36.53	56.33
3.Dictionary	6	1.913	2.185	2.273	31.88	38.92	37.88
5.Finding Information	12	7.375	9.000	8.409	61.46	75.00	70.07
6.Encyclopedia	5	3.522	4.037	4.136	70.44	80.79	82.72
7.Study Skills	6	4.130	4.111	3.818	68.83	68.52	63.63
8.Phonics	21	5.261	6.290	6.913	25.05	29.95	32.91
9.Inferences	5	1.083	1.400	1.591	21.66	28.00	31.82
10.Main Ideas	2	0.870	0.806	1.391	43.50	40.30	69.55
11.Reading Speed	3	1.583	1.960	1.227	52.76	65.33	40.90
12.Newspaper	7	3.094	2.678	4.174	44.20	38.26	59.62
13.Syllabication	15	7.917	8.840	7.773	52.78	58.93	51.02
14.Sight Words	100	97.957	98.82	98.91	97.96	98.82	98.91
15.Card Catalogue	3	0.987	1.290	1.913	32.60	43.00	63.76
16.Outlining	14	3.958	5.120	4.909	28.27	36.57	35.06
17.Common Symbols	5	2.696	2.806	3.652	53.92	56.12	73.09
19.Use of Charts, Graphs	3	1.522	1.871	2.391	50.73	62.36	79.70
20.Separate Fact-Bias	12	8.792	9.090	9.273	73.27	75.75	77.28

Table 51

Analysis of Variance - Reading Diagnostic Survey - Students Grades 6,8, and 10.

	Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Objective #2	Between	2	7.324	3.662	3.398
	Within	74	79.746	1.078	p<.05
	Total	76	87.0702		
Objective #3	Between	2	1.647	0.824	0.4092
	Within	74	148.922	2.012	n.s.
	Total	76	150.569		
Objective #4	Between	2	11.685	5.843	6.0947
	Within	74	70.938	0.959	p<.01
	Total	76	82.623		
Objective #5	Between	2	35.031	17.515	2.899
	Within	74	447.071	6.042	n.s.
	Total	76	482.102		
Objective #6	Between	2	5.137	2.568	0.288
	Within	74	659.668	8.914	n.s.
	Total	76	664.805		
Objective #7	Between	2	1.467	0.734	0.222
	Within	74	244.857	3.309	n.s.
	Total	76	246.324		
Objective #8	Between	2	32.148	16.074	0.5459
	Within	74	2178.592	29.440	n.s.
	Total	76	2210.740		
Objective #9	Between	2	3.041	1.521	0.744
	Within	74	151.191	2.043	n.s.
	Total	76	154.232		
Objective #10	Between	2	5.072	2.536	0.623
	Within	74	301.325	4.072	n.s.
	Total	76	306.397		
Objective #11	Between	2	7.162	3.581	2.722
	Within	74	97.364	1.316	n.s.
	Total	76	104.527		

Table 51
(con't)

Objective #12	Between	2	30.340	15.169	9.528
	Within	74	117.818	1.592	$p < .01$
	Total	76	148.158		
Objective #13	Between	2	18,573	9.287	0.601
	Within	74	1144.211	15.462	n.s.
	Total	76	1162.784		
Objective #14	Between	2	13.211	6.605	2.178
	Within	74	224.477	3.033	n.s.
	Total	76	237.688		
Objective #15	Between	2	10.501	5.251	4.310
	Within	74	80.779	1.092	$p < .05$
	Total	76	91.280		
Objective #16	Between	2	19.129	9.564	0.4809
	Within	74	1471.573	19.886	n.s.
	Total	76	1490.701		
Objective #17	Between	2	13.018	6.509	1.948
	Within	74	247.217	3.341	n.s.
	Total	76	260.235		
Objective #18	Between	2	11.044	5.522	2.322
	Within	74	176.013	2.379	n.s.
	Total	76	187.057		
Objective #19	Between	2	8.819	4.410	4.275
	Within	74	76.334	1.032	$p < .05$
	Total	76	85.153		
Objective #20	Between	2	2.722	1.361	0.205
	Within	74	492.165	6.651	n.s.
	Total	76	494.887		

Table 52

Means and Standard Deviations - Teaching Situation Reaction Test

	N	X	SD
Secondary - English	5	197.6	7.76
Secondary - Other	18	187.55	17.15
Elementary - Primary	12	191.58	21.88
Elementary - Intermediate	11	194.73	24.11
Elementary - Special	6	181.33	17.05
All Secondary	23	189.74	16.14
All Elementary	29	191.00	22.37
All Teachers	52	190.44	19.87

Table 53

Analysis of Variance - TSRT

Secondary English and Secondary Other Teachers

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Between	1	395.23	395.23	1.48
Within	21	5595.40	266.45	n.s.
Total	22	5990.63		

Elementary Primary, Intermediate, and Special Teachers

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Between	2	714.66	357.33	0.6692
Within	26	13882.22	533.93	n.s.
Total	28	14596.88		

Secondary and Elementary Teachers

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Between	1	20.39	20.39	0.0497
Within	50	20503.58	410.07	n.s.
Total	51	20523.97		

All Teachers and Pre-service Teacher Education Students

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Between	1	23196.32	23196.32	89.4298
Within	225	58360.53	259.38	$p < .01$
Total	226	81556.85		

Table 54

Means and Standard Deviations - Internality-Externality Scale

	N	$\overline{X}$	SD
Secondary English	5	7.2	1.94
Secondary Other	18	10.11	4.01
Elementary - Primary	12	7.92	2.66
Elementary - Intermediate	11	10.55	3.03
Elementary - Special	6	9.67	3.82
All Secondary	23	9.48	3.85
All Elementary	29	9.28	3.29
All Teachers	52	9.37	3.55

Table 55

Analysis of Variance - IE Scale

Secondary English and Secondary Other Teachers

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Between	1	33.14	33.14	2.255
Within	21	308.57	14.69	n.s.
Total	22	341.71		

Elementary Primary, Intermediate and Special Teachers

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Between	2	40.69	20.35	1.938
Within	26	272.96	10.49	n.s.
Total	28	313.65		

Secondary and Elementary Teachers

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Between	1	1.53	0.53	0.0403
Within	50	655.33	13.11	n.s
Total	51	655.86		

All Teachers and O.S.U. Elementary Psychology Students

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Between	1	57.59	57.59	3.6789
Within	1230	19253.89	15.65	$p < .05$
Total	1230	19311.48		

Table 56

Means and Standard Deviations - Instructional Materials Survey

Item	Primary(N=7)		Intermediate (N=10)		Special(N=5)		English(N=4)		Secondary(N=9)	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
1	3.57	0.728	3.80	0.979	2.60	1.497	4.25	0.829	3.00	1.491
2	4.42	0.728	4.00	0.775	3.00	1.414	3.75	0.433	2.22	1.227
3	2.71	1.030	2.80	1.077	2.60	1.019	3.50	1.118	2.88	1.448
4	2.71	1.030	2.20	0.979	2.40	0.800	3.00	0.707	2.33	0.942
5	2.28	0.833	2.40	1.200	2.80	1.327	4.00	0.707	2.00	1.054
6	3.28	1.578	3.90	1.513	4.20	1.166	4.00	0.707	3.00	1.323
7	3.14	1.641	2.40	1.562	2.40	2.245	3.00	1.225	2.50	1.323
8	2.14	0.989	1.50	1.204	1.00	0.632	2.25	1.639	1.00	0.000
9	1.85	1.552	1.70	1.100	2.20	1.600	2.75	0.829	1.63	1.317
10	1.57	0.903	1.80	1.327	1.40	0.489	1.50	0.500	1.38	0.696
11	4.55	0.495	3.80	1.400	3.40	1.959	4.00	1.225	3.11	1.595
12	1.71	1.278	3.00	1.414	2.20	1.166	3.25	1.479	1.00	0.000
13	3.00	1.690	3.40	1.496	3.20	1.833	3.00	1.581	1.00	0.000
14	2.71	1.578	3.00	2.00	1.60	1.356	2.50	1.118	1.00	0
15	3.00	1.773	4.00	1.183	1.40	1.854	2.00	1.225	1.00	0
16	3.00	1.773	3.30	1.847	1.40	1.854	2.75	0.829	1.00	0
17	2.85	1.245	3.20	1.400	2.60	1.496	3.25	1.479	1.25	0.661
18	2.55	1.591	2.20	1.600	1.20	0.979	2.00	1.224	1.13	0.331
19	2.00	1.428	2.90	1.483	1.60	1.200	2.25	1.639	1.00	0
20	2.85	2.030	3.90	1.578	2.40	1.496	2.50	0.866	1.00	0

Table 56
(con't)

21	2.55	1.591	2.60	1.625	3.40	1.356	2.00	1.000	1.63	1.320
22	0.85	0.349	1.10	0.538	1.20	0.400	2.28	1.299	1.38	0.696
23	3.71	1.278	3.80	0.979	2.00	1.673	3.75	0.433	1.50	0.707
24	3.14	1.125	3.70	0.640	2.80	0.979	3.00	1.225	2.13	1.269
25	3.71	0.699	3.80	0.600	3.60	0.800	3.25	1.299	2.55	1.257
26	3.71	0.452	3.60	0.800	2.20	1.469	2.75	1.479	2.00	1.414
27	3.71	0.452	4.10	0.539	2.80	0.748	2.50	1.500	1.71	1.385
28	3.28	1.030	3.60	0.800	3.20	0.979	3.50	0.866	2.38	1.653
29	3.85	0.349	3.90	0.539	3.60	1.019	3.25	0.829	2.88	1.536
30	2.42	1.049	3.40	0.800	1.80	1.833	3.00	1.000	2.13	1.536
31	2.57	0.728	1.80	1.326	2.20	1.600	4.00	0.707	1.00	0
32	3.42	1.049	3.60	0.800	2.60	1.496	2.00	1.225	1.63	1.317
33	2.85	1.265	2.90	1.300	2.40	1.744	2.25	1.299	1.00	0
34	1.57	1.049	2.70	1.345	1.80	0.748	1.75	1.299	1.00	0

* Note: One form was incomplete; thus for some items N=8.

Table 57

Rankings of Reported Incidence of Use of Instructional Materials from Highest to Lowest

Primary		Intermediate		Special		English		Secondary	
Item	$\overline{X}$	Item	$\overline{X}$	Item	$\overline{X}$	Item	$\overline{X}$	Item	$\overline{X}$
11	4.55	27	4.10	6	4.20	1	4.25	11	3.11
2	4.42	2	4.00	25	3.60	5	4.00	1	3.00
29	3.85	15	4.00	29	3.60	6	4.00	6	3.00
23	3.71	6	3.90	11	3.40	11	4.00	3	2.88
25	3.71	20	3.90	21	3.40	31	4.00	29	2.88
26	3.71	29	3.90	13	3.20	2	3.75	25	2.55
27	3.71	1	3.80	28	3.20	23	3.75	7	2.50
1	3.57	11	3.80	2	3.00	3	3.50	28	2.38
32	3.42	23	3.80	5	2.80	28	3.50	4	2.33
6	3.28	25	3.80	24	2.80	12	3.25	2	2.22
28	3.28	27	3.70	27	2.80	17	3.25	24	2.13
7	3.14	26	3.60	1	2.60	25	3.25	30	2.13
24	3.14	28	3.60	3	2.60	29	3.25	5	2.00
13	3.00	32	3.60	17	2.60	4	3.00	26	2.00
15	3.00	13	3.40	32	2.60	7	3.00	27	1.71
16	3.00	30	3.40	4	2.40	13	3.00	9	1.63
17	2.85	16	3.30	7	2.40	24	3.00	21	1.63
20	2.85	17	3.20	20	2.40	30	3.00	32	1.63
33	2.85	12	3.00	33	2.40	9	2.75	23	1.50
3	2.71	14	3.00	9	2.20	16	2.75	10	1.38
4	2.71	19	2.90	12	2.20	26	2.75	22	1.38

Table 57
(con't)

14	2.71	33	2.90	26	2.20	14	2.50	17	1.25
31	2.57	3	2.80	31	2.20	20	2.50	18	1.13
18	2.55	34	2.70	23	2.00	27	2.50	8	1.00
21	2.55	21	2.60	30	1.80	8	2.25	12	1.00
30	2.42	5	2.40	34	1.80	19	2.25	13	1.00
5	2.28	7	2.40	14	1.60	22	2.25	14	1.00
8	2.14	4	2.20	19	1.60	33	2.25	15	1.00
19	2.00	18	2.20	10	1.40	15	2.00	16	1.00
9	1.85	10	1.80	15	1.40	18	2.00	19	1.00
12	1.71	31	1.80	16	1.40	21	2.00	20	1.00
10	1.57	9	1.70	18	1.20	32	2.00	31	1.00
34	1.57	8	1.50	22	1.20	34	1.75	33	1.00
22	0.85	22	1.10	8	1.00	10	1.50	34	1.00

Table 58

Analysis of Variance - Instructional Materials Survey-
Primary, Intermediate, Special, English and Secondary
Other

	Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Item #1	Between	4	9.304	2.326	1.476
	Within	30	47.256	1.575	n.s.
	Total	34	56.560		
Item#2	Between	4	24.599	6.149	8.816
	Within	30	20.926	0.697	$p < .01$
	Total	34	35.525		
Item#3	Between	4	2.172	0.543	0.338
	Within	30	48.087	1.602	n.s.
	Total	34	50.259		
Item #4	Between	4	2.449	0.612	0.608
	Within	30	30.196	1.006	n.s.
	Total	34	32.645		
Item #5	Between	4	12.132	3.033	2.271
	Within	30	40.059	1.335	n.s.
	Total	34	52.192		
Item #6	Between	4	6.927	1.731	0.795
	Within	29	63.122	2.1766	n.s.
	Total	33	70.049		
Item #7	Between	4	3.287	0.821	0.269
	Within	29	88.453	3.050	n.s.
	Total	33	91.741		

Table 58
(con't)

Item #8	Between	4	8.338	2.084	1.7737
	Within	29	34.085	1.175	n.s.
	Total	33	42.423		
Item #9	Between	4	4.336	1.084	0.538
	Within	29	58.385	2.013	n.s
	Total	33	62.722		
Item #10	Between	4	0.978	0.244	0.241
	Within	29	29.388	1.013	n.s.
	Total	33	30.366		
Item #11	Between	4	9.049	2.262	0.977
	Within	30	69.402	2.313	n.s.
	Total	34	78.451		
Item #12	Between	4	23.990	5.997	3.711
	Within	29	46.861	1.615	$p<.05$
	Total	33	70.851		
Item #13	Between	4	30.241	7.560	3.169
	Within	29	69.170	2.385	$p<.05$
	Total	33	99.411		
Item #14	Between	4	21.899	5.474	2.216
	Within	29	71.623	2.469	n.s.
	Total	33	93.523		
Item #15	Between	4	51.371	12.842	6.509
	Within	30	59.188	1.972	$p<.01$
	Total	34	110.559		

Table 58
(con't)

Item #16	Between	4	31.714	7.928	3.023
	Within	29	76.054	2.622	$p<.05$
	Total	33	107.768		
Item #17	Between	4	20.301	5.075	2.731
	Within	29	53.885	1.858	$p<.05$
	Total	33	74.186		
Item #18	Between	4	11.004	2.751	1.451
	Within	29	54.980	1.895	n.s.
	Total	33	65.985		
Item #19	Between	4	17.150	4.287	2.534
	Within	29	49.067	1.691	n.s.
	Total	33	66.217		
Item #20	Between	4	38.048	9.512	4.317
	Within	29	63.899	2.203	$p<.01$
	Total	33	101.947		
Item #21	Between	4	10.938	2.734	1.097
	Within	29	72.242	2.491	n.s.
	Total	33	83.80		
Item #22	Between	4	5.485	1.371	2.637
	Within	29	15.078	0.519	n.s.
	Total	33	20.564		
Item #23	Between	4	35.1474	8.786	6.408
	Within	29	39.760	1.371	$p<.01$
	Total	33	74.908		

Table 58
(con't)

Item #24	Between	4	11.292	2.823	2.237
	Within	29	36.584	1.261	n.s.
	Total	33	47.876		
Item #25	Between	4	9.031	2.257	2.171
	Within	30	31.190	1.029	n.s.
	Total	34	40.221		
Item #26	Between	4	18.457	4.614	3.085
	Within	29	43.364	1.495	$p<.05$
	Total	33	61.821		
Item #27	Between	4	29.934	7.483	6.894
	Within	29	31.478	1.085	$p<.01$
	Total	33	61.412		
Item #28	Between	4	7.365	1.841	1.230
	Within	29	43.398	1.496	n.s.
	Total	33	50.763		
Item #29	Between	4	5.803	1.450	1.387
	Within	29	30.327	1.045	n.s.
	Total	33	36.130		
Item #30	Between	4	12.244	3.056	1.648
	Within	29	53.776	1.854	n.s.
	Total	33	66.00		
Item #31	Between	4	26.611	6.652	5.345
	Within	29	36.092	1.244	$p<.01$
	Total	33	62.703		

Table 58
(con't)

Item #32	Between	4	22.758	5.689	3.652
	Within	29	45.171	1.557	$p<.05$
	Total	33	67.929		
Item #33	Between	4	19.295	4.823	1.794
	Within	29	50.058	1.726	$p<.05$
	Total	33	69.354		
Item #34	Between	4	13.581	3.395	2.786
	Within	29	35.340	1.218	$p<.05$
	Total	33	48.922		

Table 59

Readability and Comprehension Levels for Selected Textbooks

ON WE GO, Reading For Memory, Fourth Edition, Paul McKee, et al., 1900 South Batavia Avenue, Geneva, Illinois, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

Readability

PAGE		SYLLABLES	SENTENCES	ESTIMATED GRADE
77-78		122	10.6	2-3
124		114	10.6	2
194		118	8	3
245		116	10.4	2
	Average	118.5	9.95	2

Comprehension: Teacher's Manual

PAGE	QUESTIONS	LEVEL
80		
Purpose		2
Discussion		
	1	2
	2	2
	3	3
Oral Reading	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
150		
Purpose	1	1
Discussion	1	1
	2	1
	3	2
Oral Reading	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
242		
Purpose	1	2
Discussion	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
	5	2
Oral Reading	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
	5	1
	6	1
	7	1
	8	1

Table 59
(con't)

HIGH ROADS, Reading For Meaning, Fourth Edition, Paul McKee, et. al., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1966.

		Readability		
Page		Syllables	Sentences	Estimated Grade
45		117	5.4	6
117		120	9	3
232		123	7.4	4
305		120	5.2 (6)	6 (6)
	Average	120	6.75	5

	Comprehension	
Page	Question	Level
80		
Purpose	None	
83		
Discussion	1	1
	2	2
	3	2
	4	
	5	1
	6	1
	7	1
	8	1
	9	1
	10	1
Thinking Critically	1	4
	2	4
	3	3
	4	3
	5	3
	6	3
	7	4
	8	4
	9	3

Table 59
(con't)

BRIGHT PEAKS Reading for Meaning, Fourth Edition, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

	Readability		
Pages	Syllables	Sentences	Estimated Grade
61	124	10	3
183	122	7.1	5
280-81	125	5.5	6
347	122	3.4 (54)	Invalid (6)
Average	123	6.5	6 (5)

	Comprehension: Manual	
Pages	Question	Level
172	Reason Inferred	
Purpose		
177		
Discussion	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
	5	1
	6	1
	7	1
	8	1
	9	1
	10	1
Thinking Critically	1	3
	2	3
	3	3
	4	3
	5	3
	6	3
	7	3
	8	4

Table 59
(con't)

FOCUS. GALAXY SERIES, Stephen Dunning, Elsie Katterjohn, Olive Stafford Niles, 1900 East Lake Avenue, Scott Foresman and Commpany, 1969.

Readability

Page		Syllables	Sentences	Estimated Grade
56		143	10	6
155		130	13.8	2
292		141	4.7	8
447		142	5.5	7
461	Average	126	10.3	3
	Average	136.4	8.86	6

Comprehension: Test Questions

Page	Question	Level
247	1.	3
	2. a.	2
	b.	2
	3.	2
	4.	3
396	1. aa.	2
	ab	4
	b	4
	2. a	1
	b	1
	3.	2

Comprehension: Teacher Manual
Guidebook to Accompany Focus (1970)

Page	Question	Level
68		
Purpose for Reading	a.	1
	b.	2
Discussion	a.	1
	b.	2
	c.	2
Concluding Discussion	a.	2
	b.	2
	c.	3
	d.	3
	e.	3

PERSPECTIVES. GALAXY SERIES, Robert C. Pooley, Alfred H. Grommon, Elsie Kotterjohn and Frances Magdanz, 1900 East Lake Avenue, Glenview, Illinois, Scott Foresman and Company, 1969.

Table 59
(cont'd)

Page		Readability Syllables	Sentences	Estimated Grade
105		114	7	4
224		123	7	5
297		119	7	5
446		127	8	5
	Average	120.8	7.2	5

Page	Comprehension: Text Questions Question	Level
173	1.	4
	2. a.	1
	b.	2
	3. a.	1
	b.	2
	4. a.	3
	b.	2
	5. a.	2
	b.	3
	c.	3
	6.	3
	7. a.	1
	b.	1
	c.	1
	d.	1
	e.	1
	f.	1

ADVENTURES IN APPRECIATION, Laureate Edition, Adventure in Literature Series, Walter Loban and Rosalind A. Olmsted, 7555 Caldwell Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, Harcourt Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

Page		Readability Syllables	Sentences	Estimated Grade
105		126	4.0 (5.0)	7
395		148	5.8 (6.8)	8
473		133	4.3 (6)	8 (7)
629		124	2.5 (5)	Invalid (7)
	Average	132.8	4.15(5.7)	8 (7)

Page	Comprehension: Text Questions Questions	Level
149	1.	2
	2.	1
	3.	3
	4. a.	2
	b.	1
	c.	3

Table 59
(cont'd)

Page	Questions	Level
440	1. a.	2
	b.	2
	2.	1
	3.	3
	4. a.	2
	b.	3
	c.	3
	5. a.	3
	b.	1
	c.	1
	d.	3
	6. a.	3
	b.	3
	c.	3

ADVENTURES IN ENGLISH LITERATURE, Laureate Edition. J.B. Priestley and Josephine Spear, 7555 Caldwell Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

		Readability		
Page		Syllables	Sentences	Estimated Grade
100		144	4 (5)	9
244		129	5 (7)	7 (6) (poetry)
526		149	4.9	9
756		150	4.3 (5.3)	10 (9)
	Average	143	4.55 (5.55)	9 (8)

	Comprehension: Text Questions	
Page	Questions	Level
346 (poetry)	1. a.	2
	b.	2
	c.	2
	d.	3
	2.	2
	3.	3
	4.	3
	5. a.	3
	b.	3
642	1. a.	3
	b.	3
	2. a.	2
	b.	2
	c.	3
	3. a.	1
	b.	1
	c.	4
	d.	3

Table 59
(cont'd)

Page	Questions	Level	
112-13	1	1	In surveying these
	2	1	tests in the manual
	3	1	this appeared a most
	4	1	common pattern.
	5	1	Literal: Recall questions

*Josephine Spear, Teacher's Manual for Adventures in English Literature, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

Table 59
(cont'd)

RISE OF THE AMERICAN NATION, New Second Edition, 1969, Lewis Paul Todd and Merle Curte, Harcourt, Brace and World, New York.

	Readability		
Page	Syllables	Sentences	Estimated Grade
468	150	5.0	9
559	149	5.7	9
619	158	5.8	10
750	169	7.7	Invalid
838	164	4.4	12
Average	157.7	5.7	10

	Comprehension: Text Questions		
Page	Question	Level	
507	1.	1	
	2.	2	
(Section Survey)	3.	1	
	4.	1	
738	1.	1	
	2.	2	(Typical pattern
	3.	1	re-occurring
	4.	1	throughout the text)
	5.	1	

WORKBOOK TO ACCOMPANY RISE OF THE AMERICAN NATION, by Isadore Starr, Harcourt, 1966.

Page	Question	Level
149	1.	1
	2.	1
	3.	1
	4.	1
	5.	1
	6.	1
	7.	1
	8.	1
	9.	1
	10.	1
	11.	1
	12.	1

Total Book at Literal Level.

Table 59
(cont'd)

WEST VIRGINIA, YESTERDAY AND TODAY, Education Foundation.

Page		Syllables	Sentences	Estimated Grade
103		131	5.1 (7.1)	7.0 (6.0)
155		155	7.1	8.0
251		132	5.8	7.0
	Average	139	6.0	7.0

Comprehension: Text Questions

Page	Question	Level
105	1.	1
	2.	2
	3.	1
	5.	2
	6.	1
	8.	1
	9.	1
	10.	2
	11.	2
	12.	1
	13.	1
	14.	2
	15.	1
	16.	1
	17.	1
	18.	1
	19.	1
	20.	3
	21.	3

Table 60

Summary: Readability and Comprehension Levels

			Comprehension Level			
	Actual Grade	Assigned Grade	1	2	3	4
Basal: Houghton-Mifflin Co.						
On We Go	2	2^2				
Discussion			.50	.43	.07	-
Oral Reading			1.00	-	-	-
High Roads	5	4				
Discussion			.80	.20	-	-
Oral Reading			-	-	.56	.44
Bright Peaks	6 (5)[a]	6				
Discussion			1.00	-	-	-
Oral Reading			-	-	.88	.12
English/Reading-Secondary						
Focus	6	8				
Text			.18	.46	.18	.18
Guidebook			.20	.50	.30	-
Perspectives						
Text	5	10	.47	.24	.24	.05
Adv. in Appreciation	8 (7)[a]	10				
Text			.25	.25	.50	-
Adv. in English Lit.						
Text	9 (8)		.11	.35	.47	.06
Manual			1.00			
Social Studies						
West Virginia Text	7	8	.63	.27	.10	-
Rise of Amer. Nation						
Text	10	10	.78	.22	-	-
Workbook			1.00	-	-	-

Legend:

Comprehension Levels - Barrett Taxonomy - "Taxonomy for Reading Comprehension" Thomas C. Barrett.

Level Notations - 1. Knowledge (Literal)
2. Inference
3. Evaluation
4. Appreciative Response

Level Figures - .50 = 50 percent

Readability Grading - "Graph for Estimating Readability", Edward Fry.

[a] Figures in parentheses indicate possible variation when alternate forms of computation are used.

Table 61

Estimated Grade Level Using Fry Readability Guide

Code	Syllables	Sentences		Estimated Grade
		Phonological	Actual	
4	117	11	(9)	2 (3)
5		Insufficient Sample*		
3		Insufficient Sample		
6	115	16		1.5
8		Insufficient Sample		
11	119	12.6	(9)	2 (3)
12	114	13.8		1
13	115	12		2
14	116	12		2
16	114	9	(7)	3 (4.0)
23		Insufficient Sample		
24		Insufficient Sample		
28	113	10		2
29		Insufficient Sample		
7		Insufficient Sample		
10	125	10.2		3
26	114	7.4		3
39	117	7.8	(4.9)	3 (6)
35	132	10.8	(7.8)	4 (6)
46	127	5.5		6
42	123	7.2		5
43	113	7		4
37	119	5.7		6
36	125	8		4

*Less than 100 words in sample

Table 62

Language Analysis Summary

	Code	Verbalization Level	Language Classification										Sentence Patterns (Structure)											Convex Structure	Grade Level Score
			I			II				III		IV													
			0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	z		
	4	4																							2.0 (3)
	5	2																							
*	3	2		19		2							3	1	5				1			12			
	6	3																							1.5
*	8	2		18		4						3	4	3	1	1		3				10			
	11	4																							2.0 (3)
*	12	2		11		7			1			3	4	3		1		2				11		1	1.0
*	13	3		10		3		1			2	4	3	11				1				7			2.0
	14	5																							2.0
	16	4																							3.0 (4.0)
	23	2																							
*	24	2		9		1		1			1	2	2									12			
	28	4																							2.0
	29	2																							
	7	2																							
	10	5																							3.0
*	26	4		13	11							3	5	12				2				7		4	3.0
	39	3																							3.0 (6.0)
	35	5																							4.0 (6.0)
	46	5																							6
	42	5																							5
*	43	5																							4
*	37	3		5		4							3	6	3										6
	36	4																							4
	Total		0	85	11	21	0	2	1	0	3	15	24	36	9	2	0	8	1	0	0	59	0	5	